

SENATE.

MONDAY, July 28, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.
The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate from the governor of Georgia certifying the election of Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON as a Senator from the State of Georgia, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, July 25, 1913.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that at an election held pursuant to law in the State of Georgia on the 15th day of July, 1913, by the electors in said State having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON was by said electors duly chosen a Senator from said State in the Senate of the Congress of the United States for and during the remainder of the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1913, and ending on the 3d day of March, 1919, the returns from said election having been canvassed by the general assembly of said State and the result certified to this department on this date.

In witness whereof his excellency, the governor, and the great seal of the State of Georgia hereto affixed at the capitol in Atlanta this the 25th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1913.

JOHN M. SLATON, Governor.

By the Governor:

PHILIP COOK, Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, for over 20 years past the advocates of popular government have been pressing forward toward a change of our plan of electing United States Senators. During the present year a sufficient number of States had ratified the right of the people to elect their Senators, and the proclamation was issued announcing an amendment to the Constitution to this end. On July 15 the first election was held under the new amendment, and in the State of Georgia the people for the first time selected a United States Senator at the ballot box.

It is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that, without opposition, the senior Senator from Georgia received all the votes cast at this election, that his credentials are here and have been read, and that he is present. I ask that an opportunity be given that he may qualify as elected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect will present himself at the Vice President's desk for that purpose.

Mr. BACON was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SMITH of Georgia; and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Asbust	Fall	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Fletcher	Myers	Smoot
Bankhead	Gallinger	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Gronna	Norris	Stone
Bradley	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Brady	James	Overman	Swanson
Brandeggee	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Thompson
Bryan	Jones	Pittman	Thornton
Cañon	Kenyon	Reed	Tillman
Chamberlain	Kern	Robinson	Townsend
Chilton	La Follette	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Clapp	Lane	Sheppard	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Lea	Sherman	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Shields	Weeks
Crawford	Lodge	Simmons	Williams
Cummins	McLean	Smith, Ga.	Works
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITION.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ingham County, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2836) to provide a penalty for retention or misuse of confidential records by former Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2837) granting a pension to Matilda Robertson (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Putnam (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2839) granting an increase of pension to Theodore C. Bates (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 2840) for the relief of Edgar R. Kellogg; and

A bill (S. 2841) for the relief of the estate of Francis E. Lacey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 2842) to reimburse Jetta Lee, late postmaster at Newport, Tenn., for key funds stolen from post office (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

THE MODERN BY-PRODUCT COKE OVEN (S. DOC. NO. 145).

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a pamphlet I hold in my hand, by C. A. Meissner, chairman coke committee, United States Steel Corporation. I will say by way of information to the Senate that it is a treatise by an eminent author on the conservation of the mineral resources of the United States. I have examined it carefully, and I think it contains more valuable information which will lead to greater economy in the production of coke, iron, and steel, if the suggestions are carried out, than any other document printed. The paper contains illustrations which I ask may be printed in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the paper with illustrations will be printed as a public document.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321, the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. THORNTON. I desire to announce that at the close of the routine business on next Thursday I shall expect to address the Senate on the pending tariff bill with particular reference to the sugar schedule.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] I shall wish to make some observations on the tariff bill, and especially on the agricultural schedule.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, before the pending tariff bill can be intelligently discussed it is necessary to understand the circumstances and conditions under which it was conceived and brought forth. It may not be without profit to review briefly the events of the last four or five years, which have culminated in the legislation of this Congress.

I shall not enter upon a detailed discussion of the bill now before us, for all know how useless that would be, inasmuch as it is already clearly known that a sufficient number of Democratic Senators are bound to vote for the administration's measure, either upon its first passage through the Senate or after conference, as it will be after the final vote is had. Furthermore, it is better for the country to have this question settled without further delay. Already weary months have been spent by the majority in shaping a bill, the fundamentals of which had been established by Executive order in advance, and I trust no one will unduly postpone the time when the now inevitable fiscal policy, promulgated by men more foreign in their sympathies than American, shall begin its operation. I shall delay the vote but a short time.

It is said that the Payne tariff bill caused the pending measure. To a certain extent that is true; but it was not because the Payne bill was intrinsically a bad bill that a political upheaval occurred, but rather it was partially because politicians said it was a bad bill and a betrayal of Republican pledges. I am clear in my own mind, however, that the act of 1909 was the convenient means which accomplished Republican defeat and gave the Democratic Party its opportunity.

Industrial, moral, and intellectual progress was never so great as under the unhampered operation of the Payne tariff law. It closed no factory. It denied to none an opportunity to work at the greatest wage ever paid in any land at any time. It filled our Treasury to overflowing and supplied the money for the most extensive internal improvements ever undertaken in our national life. Under it the prosperity of every producing and creating class of our citizens has been increased. Under it our markets abroad have been extended. Under it

our production at home has multiplied. The impetus given to manufacture drew labor from every quarter and the demand which high wages created for foodstuffs caused these products to increase in value, and the Democratic campaign cry of 1896 that prices were too low was changed, and in 1912 they were too high. Nothing could more clearly show the substantial business prosperity which has maintained under the existing tariff than its ability to withstand up to this time even approximately the destructive attacks by the present administration. But if this is so, how can it be said that the Payne law was the cause of the unfortunate political condition in which the country finds itself to-day?

Recently veterans of the Civil War from Dixie and the Northland held a reunion on one of the most famous battle fields of the world. They gathered at that place, made sacred by the results of those gloriously awful three days' struggle, and with faltering steps and age-dimmed eyes they sought familiar spots which lagging memories said were there. Gettysburg is a beautiful place, where grass and flowers and trees and marble attempt to cover the scars of war on the sides of its hills, but it is not that sloping grave-studded field of Pennsylvania that makes Gettysburg sacred. It is because that there 50 years ago 160,000 of the flower of the fairest Nation on earth met in the greatest battle of history. It is because from its hills and vales the spirits of 40,000 American heroes took their flight to the realm where war drums never beat and where battle flags are forever furled. It is because that was the spot where the resurrection light of a redeemed and united Nation penetrated the gloom of agony and death.

The Battle of Gettysburg had to be fought, but the field is entitled to neither blame nor censure.

The Payne bill was the Gettysburg where the factions of the Republican Party were formed in battle array, and it was but an incident to the political results which followed. The Democratic Party, in the campaigns of 1910 and 1912, were beneficiaries of Republican dissensions. When the tariff revision of 1909 occurred, the inevitable conflict between certain long-recognized and arrogant leaders of the Republican Party on one side and a new set of equally determined men who desired to be leaders on the other side was on. The tariff furnished the opportunity of the latter class to exploit the dictatorial and inexcusable methods of the former, and in the struggle for leadership the Republican Party was sacrificed. I myself desired a more radical revision of the tariff, not that I expected any great benefit therefrom to the consumers, but because there seemed to be a great demand for such a revision, and it could be made at that time without injury to the welfare of the country.

The struggle against the political boss was waging before the tariff bill of 1909 was drawn. Its first expression was given when certain Republican leaders in the House resisted the reform measures of President Roosevelt. Insurgency against the rules of the House developed into insurgency against Speaker Cannon and his kitchen cabinet. It was a protest of Representatives against the close corporation of legislative party managers. The cause of insurgency was everlastingly right, as history will record, but it furnished the opportunity for the professional agitator. It became popular to attack any active and prominent Republican, and many men who otherwise would have been born to blush unseen in the desert of obscurity suddenly sprang into prominence, and the lecture platforms throughout the country were the opportunity both for profit and exploitation as they were also for much desirable information and entertainment.

In the midst of this excitement the tariff bill of 1909 came up for consideration. The history of that struggle when read in the clearer light of the future will disclose that it was a contest waged principally for the object of leadership. The bill in the Senate was in charge of men who gave little thought to Republican harmony and treated all opponents of the measure as part of the enemy. The minority faction of the Republicans had the opportunity to gain notoriety by fighting the majority, and neither side manifested any strong desire to unite their forces against the common political enemy and in favor of a bill which would be reasonably acceptable to all.

In the Civil War there were guerrilla bands which fought from ambush and fired from the rear.

Stonewall Jackson, one of the greatest generals of the Confederacy and one whom the Northern Army had not captured or destroyed, was, by mistake, shot by his own soldiers. So, in the tariff war, there were influences which worked by methods not known to usual warfare, and the Republican Party, either intentionally or by mistake, was shot to pieces by its own forces.

The Democratic Party was the beneficiary of this condition, it having been furnished the ammunition with which to rout its disorganized opponents.

From the insurgent effort has come great good to the country, and, as usual in matters of reform, some harm has attached. Popular government, except in this Congress, is more a fact to-day because of the agitation against machine methods and political bossism. The demand for cleaner politics and wider participation in government by the people is irresistible, and, if a republic is desirable, this movement is right. Real, genuine reform is never lost, although it may be retarded and temporarily suspended. It seems to me that greater and more substantial progress could be made if those elements which effect it and really desire it would not forget that in striving for a good cause should be taken to do no wrong. The muckraker while wearing the livery of a just cause is its worst enemy. Justice is not advanced by doing injustice. To-day, as at all times in the past, the sensational is too prominently featured and too little attention given to the truth. Indeed, a saturnalia of abuse and misrepresentation seems to be reigning, and Congress has been stamped into investigations of itself, and the two Houses are struggling between themselves to get possession of self-convicted scoundrels who have capitalized for financial gain the existing disposition to abuse Congressmen. Too frequently investigating committees of Congress become the instruments of partisan politics, and contempt is thereby heaped upon the National Legislature. In the wild scramble to disclose corruption the honest and sincere are deliberately and with malice aforethought besmirched with the slime of the muckraker. This is not only wrong to the individual unjustly attacked but it tends greatly to weaken just and proper criticism by creating doubt in the mind of the public as to the truth of anything that is published.

Business men and laboring men who have felt that under the Constitution they were permitted to present their views to their representatives and that it was their duty to do so are being attacked because some mountebanks have boasted of their ability to influence public men and mold legislation. That improper methods have been employed at times, that some cases of corruption have existed, no one doubts, but that men in public and private life as a general rule are honest and incorruptible is beyond dispute. Is the Nation to be strengthened either at home or abroad, is liberty to be more secure and government more desirable, by creating general contempt for business men and Congressmen? Have we reached the time when success in business without regard to the means employed to attain it is to be condemned? Criticism of wrong should be as severe as the facts warrant, and public men especially should not escape if their public acts and conduct are such as to merit condemnation. Faithfulness to public service demands that criticism of improper action should be free and unhampered, but it should always be based upon unquestioned facts and not upon innuendo or falsehood.

Why, sir, our grandeur as a Nation has been achieved, so far as its material greatness is concerned, by men of superior genius who have had the ability and courage to see and undertake and accomplish the things which have been done. Our mines and factories, our railroads and steamboat lines, our telegraph and telephone, in fact, our every great thing, has been brought to pass by men who were wise enough to see opportunities, courageous enough to undertake their development, and skillful enough to carry them to success.

This would be a sad and poor world if all of its citizens had no greater business ability than is possessed by the professional political agitator. The great majority of those who place successful men in the class of semicriminals have never given labor a day's work, have never established or maintained an industry that has added a material thing of value to the comfort and happiness of mankind. It should be our business to so legislate as to prevent oppression and wrong by the influential and strong upon the weak and helpless, but the door of opportunity for unbounded honest success should be kept wide open, and simply because a man has and is, is not sufficient reason for wholesale condemnation. It is only wrong which should be attacked, and success is not *prima facie* evidence of wrong.

The Democratic Party, through a division in the Republican ranks, is in charge of the Government by virtue of a minority of the votes cast at the last election. Government by the minority is contrary to the spirit of democracy, and at the earliest legal opportunity the majority should assume control. The Democratic Party as at present constituted has had little experience in affirmative legislation and administration. Some of its members have had, but such are in the hopeless minority.

Its mission has been one of opposition. For years it has been engaged in the work of destruction. It has experienced its most exquisite pleasure in fomenting discord and encouraging class strife. Coming, as a majority of its strength does come, from a section where labor is the poorest paid, the most servile, and has the fewest political rights of any in the United States, it stands as the laboring man's friend; yet one of its first acts of legislation was to write into the statutes a law which while giving labor a stone when it asked for bread records the shameful fact of class legislation dangerous to the very life of the Republic.

Such a party is now in full control of the Nation, and after months of secret work the Democratic Senate has presented the pending bill. It was conceived in hatred of the American policy of protection and brought forth in the darkness of the secret caucus chamber under the professional charge of one who has never had any experience in business obstetrics. Is it any wonder the thing is misshapen and deformed? Is it any wonder American progress and prosperity look with disfavor upon it?

In the campaign of 1912 Mr. Wilson assured the people that no legitimate business would be disturbed by a Democratic revision of the tariff. The Baltimore platform, as understood by the ordinary citizen, declares that no legitimate business would suffer, but now we are told that by legitimate business was meant business that could stand without protection. Is that what the Democratic candidate meant before election? Certainly that is not what many of the men who voted for him understood him to mean. I realize, of course, that Democratic platforms have declared that protection is unconstitutional, and since election the President has announced that a protective tariff is a clog to industry, and by throwing it off business will be benefited. It is predicted that the wits of business men will be sharpened so as to meet their foreign competitors.

All Democrats will claim when they come to vote on this bill, although many of them will not so claim in private conversation, that the proposed bill when enacted into law will make business better. It is loudly asserted that it will reduce the cost of living and at the same time encourage business. A great benefit will result to American producers by the admission of millions of dollars' worth of goods made by foreign labor and foreign capital, which these American manufacturers must supplant if they are to keep their factories running and their men employed. How will they do it? The Democrats say reduce their profits. But suppose, as is the fact with a majority of them, the profits are already as small as possible for a going concern. They could reduce their wage scale, but that might subject them to an investigation by this administration and, besides, it means injustice and suffering to the laborers. Finally the advocates of this bill will say, then let these men go out of business, for inasmuch as it needs protection it is not legitimate. But this would leave the field to the foreigner and to the big concerns who are already condemned as trusts. Will this administration abandon its anteelection arguments and favor monopoly in order to meet the conditions of foreign competition? Turn whichsoever way they may the advocates of competition between American producers and foreign producers without a tariff to equalize the difference between conditions here and abroad will meet disaster.

But let us see how consistent our Democratic friends are in their position as to legitimate industries.

American sugar production, according to the junior Senator from Kentucky, is not economically legitimate if it requires protection. Comparatively few people produce sugar, while all the people consume it. Therefore instead of artificially promoting it the Government should destroy it and all of the financial investments in it. Why should not this argument apply to all products North and South if it is the proper policy to follow? But in this bill rice, a southern product, is protected. Is rice more economically legitimate than sugar? Certainly not. It seems to be politically economical to protect a southern product. For years the country has been told that cotton was an example of a legitimate American product. It needs no protection. Is that true? Does not cotton need and receive protection?

I admit that, according to the Republican doctrine of protection, viz, a duty which measures the difference in cost of production here and abroad, there would be little chance to put a legitimate duty on cotton, for certainly the wages paid in the cotton fields are the lowest paid in the United States, and they compare more favorably with prices paid in competing countries. Negro slaves rocked and nurtured the cotton industry of the South in its infancy, and they and their equally hopeless descendants have tended southern cotton fields ever

since. The southern planter has no fear of strikes and eight-hour days. His labor is not organized. It is not disturbed by any wicked notions of lobbying for higher wages and a wider participation in the profits of the master. And yet, in spite of the fact that its labor is the most abject and unambitious, the cotton interests are demanding and receiving enormous protection at the hands of the Federal Government. Every year since I have been a Member of Congress, I believe, representatives of the cotton States have asked and generally received hundreds of thousands of dollars for the benefit of cotton. Hundreds of thousands of public treasure have been spent to combat the boll weevil. I have gladly voted for these appropriations, because I have believed that cotton was a product legitimate to America and necessary to its highest welfare. But it is not more legitimate, not more indigenous to the United States, than sugar cane, sugar beets, wheat, maize, or other products of agriculture. Just recently I listened to an eloquent argument by the junior Senator from South Carolina in favor of a proposition to expend millions of public money to purchase a zone of land 50 miles wide from the Gulf to the Cumberland Mountains through Alabama, in which zone no cotton was to be raised, in order to stop the eastward march of the cotton pest. Is the boll weevil more to be dreaded than the flood of pauper-made products which it is proposed shall inundate our prosperous northern and western fields and factories? Ah, gentlemen, you may refine your definitions of reform and preach your foreign-born doctrines. You may loudly proclaim your intention to benefit the consumer the while you are in secret caucus writing a sectional and destructive tariff, yet in the last analysis you will be obliged to face the American people in the open when they will have found you out. If protection is good for any legitimate industry in any section of this country—and by legitimate industry I mean any industry which can and ought to be maintained here—then it is good for all such industries in all parts of the country where it is needed, and the Congress can not in fairness or good conscience discriminate in favor of one industry as against others.

I realize, of course, that some Senators of long and distinguished experience and of great ability have more influence in great matters of legislation than others of less ability and experience. I can understand how potentially eloquent the chairman of the Finance Committee, who but two short years ago protested with righteous indignation against the cotton schedule in a tariff bill then pending before the Senate because its proposed duties were too low, although they were much higher than those he has reported in the pending bill, could be. I can readily imagine how he could secure enough sympathy to temporarily raise the House duties on cotton products, the manufacture of which has roused his somnolent State with the hum of industry. I can understand how the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, with his mysterious yet all-powerful diplomacy, could, in a measure at least, provide for the zinc and lead industries of Missouri, but I can not understand how Senators from other States similarly situated can submit to the dictates of their party leader against their publicly and privately declared convictions. Has party fealty and caucus rule reached that stage when they can control the consciences and votes of United States Senators? I fear the record will so disclose.

I believe in party harmony, and to that end I am in favor of party conferences where great policies are discussed and where every legitimate argument can be presented, but the highest public service by the legislator can not be secured by secret caucus action when such action is intended to and actually does bind him to do otherwise than his ideas of duty dictate. Parties are necessary to the proper conduct of government, but no party platform of principles can be framed which will command the unqualified approval of all of its members, much less can such a platform bind any free man upon all matters of legislation the provisions of which are not known and can not be known when the platform is adopted. No free, intelligent, patriotic representative is bound by everything in a party platform, and he feels at liberty at all times to express by his voice and vote his conscientious views. The secret caucus and undue influence of the President sometimes dissuades a legislator from his notions of duty. This is wrong and subversive of true representative government.

I stated before the lobby investigating committee that I had not seen nor discovered any insidious lobby working for or against the tariff bill through improper methods, but that the nearest approach to improper influence was that exerted by the President through the secret party caucus. After weary weeks of investigation by the committee I am still of that opinion. Nothing has been disclosed by the hearings which bear out the innuendo of the President that the largest and most in-

dustrious lobby ever known was working insidiously, with plenty of money to influence Congressmen, to defeat the present tariff revision; but it is generally believed that some Senators will vote for the bill as reported because it is an administration measure. And because the President will not compromise, these Senators will not support amendments which they believe would make the bill better if they were adopted. I have no fault to find with an Executive who urges his views strongly upon Congress, but his true relation to legislation is that which attaches to his power and duty of recommendation before a measure is enacted and of approving or vetoing after it is passed by Congress. It is the duty of Congress to legislate, and the presumption is, or should be, quite as strong that a Senator is as conscientiously striving to do his duty as is the President; but because of the surrender of the Senators and Representatives to the Executive and to the will of the caucus Congress is made subordinate to the President and its Members condemned if they shall dare to differ from him.

Legislation should be in the open. Its preparation should be in the light and all discussions which result in effecting it should be public. I have distinguished authority for this statement if it needs any substantiation, which it does not. Permit me to quote, however, from a speech made by Gov. Wilson, then candidate for President, at Portland, Oreg., on May 18, 1911:

It would be a great benefit both to our legislatures themselves and to the whole of the people if our methods of legislation might be simplified and made more public and open, so that everybody might know at each stage of legislation just what was being done and who was doing it.

As a matter of fact, it is a very confused and almost necessarily private process. When one asks who drafts the measures which are submitted by the hundreds to our legislatures the answer must be "Everybody." The bills introduced are by no means confined to those which are drafted by Members of the House. Indeed, it is probable that in every legislature the number of bills drafted by the members themselves is very much smaller than the number drafted by outsiders. They are drawn up, most of them, in lawyers' offices here, there, and everywhere for the purpose of accomplishing every sort of object sought by individuals or by groups of individuals or by organized business interests of one kind or another. Such bills are introduced by the Members of the Houses "by request" or else are taken over by them as their own and introduced without any indication that they come from outside quarters.

When they come to be considered it is only a bill here and there that is debated in public upon the floor of either House. Our legislation is, as a matter of fact, chiefly done in committee room. Sessions of legislative committees, except when they consent to hold public hearings and occasionally arrange to hear argument by outsiders, are private and, for the most part, confidential. It is considered a breach of legislative etiquette to reveal what took place in committee. Bills are smothered by the dozen after getting into committee if the members of the committee itself do not wish them reported out for action by the Houses. Those which are reported out are generally accepted by the Houses on the authority of the committees which report them and are passed for the most part almost without comment, or else rejected equally without debate.

It is easy to see that the characteristic feature of all this method of legislation is privacy. I do not mean that the privacy is in all cases deliberate. It springs out of the system itself—out of the multitude of bills to be handled and the inevitable haste in handling them. But often this privacy is made use of in the most sinister fashion for private ends and undoubtedly constitutes the main opportunity for those who wish to work schemes of their own and get legal regulations which will serve their own purpose. The political machine, when it controls legislation, can operate successfully only in private. The minute what is going on is made public it becomes impossible to carry it out. Similarly, when great commercial or financial interests have schemes of their own to work through legislation privacy is indispensable. What they wish to do could not be done in the open without such exposure and criticism as would inevitably defeat it.

These circumstances are not often consciously and distinctly analyzed by the mass of voters, but undoubtedly the great body of our citizens is vaguely conscious of them and they lie at the basis of a great deal of the distrust and uneasiness which is felt when our legislatures are in session. The great thing to be desired in this, as in all other matters of government, is publicity. There is no more reason why committee meetings, where important public matters are handled, should be private than that legislative sessions themselves should be private. If legislation is in fact accomplished in committees, committees should be public and not private instrumentalities.

He then discusses at length the seeming necessity for the Chief Executive to urge by every means within his power the measures which he believes are right, in order that the people may have their cause properly presented, but this whole method he admits is defective. Listen further to what he says:

The defect of the whole method is that it does not lead to sufficiently thorough debate. There is no one of equal authority and influence with the Executive to debate public matters officially with him; no single legislator occupies his place of advantage in getting at public opinion. There is no one in a situation of authority which enables him to answer the governor or the President as effectively as the governor or the President can himself speak by reason of his larger authority. This is not a desirable state of affairs. The great thing to be desired is debate, debate among authoritative persons as well as debate upon the stump, and the more thoroughgoing, the more fearless this debate is, the better.

Moreover, it is still further belittling to our legislators that the discussions led by our Executives should be held outside of the legislative chambers. To do this is to make the little debate that occurs in the legislature a thing of little or no significance, and it is clearly desirable, indeed imperative, that in order that the authority of our

legislative bodies should be revived the most effective and thoroughgoing debate should take place within their chambers. Undoubtedly the hope of the immediate future is that, by slowly getting rid of machine control and the control of secret interests of other kinds inside our legislative chambers, they may thoroughly regain their self-possession and their self-respect, and in regaining these may return to their one-time practice of debate and put everything that they do to the public ordeal. That way lies the recovery of their prestige, and I think there can be no doubt that the present processes of reform will presently bring about that much-to-be-desired result, when the people will again depend, and depend with confidence, upon their legislators and not lean as if for rescue upon their Executives.

Every thoughtful man will agree with the words of Gov. Wilson that legislation should be in the open and free from dictation by special interests either from without or from within the Government; by organizations of capital, of labor, or by political machines, and everything which is conducive to legislative freedom is to be commended.

Has this administration discouraged secret legislative methods or has it encouraged them and participated in them to an extent never known before? Every time this matter is called to public attention Democrats arise and make answer by calling attention to similar offenses by Republicans in previous Congresses. Is such answer sufficient? Why, Mr. President, I have taken much satisfaction in contemplating the fact that this was a progressive age and that we had our faces to the future instead of to the past. Until this Congress I had not supposed that it was a good answer to the charge of bad methods to point to previous practices. The Republican Congress did indulge what I regard as improper methods, and I have never excused them; but it never employed any so flagrantly violative of the principles of open and therefore frank and honest means of legislation as those practiced at this session of Congress and since the President delivered at Portland the speech from which I have quoted. It is more than possible that the semiclose-corporation methods employed in framing the Payne bill may have been a reason why the people put the Republican Party out of power, and yet the Democratic administration goes its predecessor several better and refers to Republican precedents as its only excuse.

Until the Congress of the United States assumes its full constitutional functions as the lawmaking branch and divests itself from all coercive or other improper influences either from without or from within the Government it will not command the respect and confidence of the people, and never in the history of our country has it been placed in so abject and humiliating a position as it finds itself in to-day. Why, Senators in charge of this bill do not understand it. We can not get an intelligent explanation of its items, and when we ask for one we are told that the matter in question was put in by the committee's expert, and the committee knows little about it.

It is no answer to the charge of caucus coercion to say that no vote was taken to bind its Members to support the administration measure. I am, of course, unacquainted with what actually occurred in the secret Democratic caucus, but I speak the common belief that a thorough understanding was reached which will be most effective in binding some Senators to vote against amendments which they believe would improve the bill. If this is true, then surely machine dictation has been potential in shaping this legislation.

As a total result of this Congress up to date it has been humiliated and disgraced before the country by unwarranted insinuations that its Members are unfit to legislate, and by their action they have acknowledged the impeachment. The business men, farmers, and laboring men, who had felt that they were a part of this Government and entitled to be heard by their representatives on matters affecting their comfort, prosperity, and happiness, have been made to feel like trespassers and offenders. The vilest self-convicted scoundrels have been permitted to smirch with their own unsupported statements the characters, or at least the reputations, of honest, conscientious men in and out of public life; and because of the official publication of these matters decent men have felt compelled to make answer to charges which no court of justice would have admitted in evidence, because of their total lack of truth and probability.

It is confidently expressed that this bill now before us will result in better business, greater general prosperity, and cheaper living. The Democratic Party promised these conditions. The President before his election and since has publicly expressed his confidence that they would prevail, and yet recall how inconsistent has been the administration's conduct with its promises. Soon after his inauguration President Wilson is reported to have made a speech in which he proposed "to hang as high as Haman" any man or concern that precipitated a panic. But why talk of a panic? Are business men or even speculators opposed to greater prosperity? Not long after this

threat by the President his Secretary of Commerce is reported as intimating that if a business man failed or if in order to meet the foreign competition recommended by the President he had to reduce his force of laborers or lessen their wages he would be investigated, and perhaps prosecuted. Why suggest such a thing at the dawn of the brighter day for business? Not long after this remarkable statement by the Secretary of Commerce the distinguished and capable Secretary of the Treasury assures the country that he has \$500,000,000 of public money which he is ready to distribute among the banks in case of need. What need? Are demands for money being made because of any unusual necessity for it by reason of moving crops or increase of business? It can not be that with increased prosperity leaping and bounding just ahead there is need of this reassuring unsolicited promise of the Secretary of the Treasury.

But this is not all. When it became sure that the President's tariff bill was to be ratified by his party in Congress Mr. Wilson presented his currency bill with the clear inference that it is needed to offset any bad effects of the tariff. Surely all this is treason to the oft-repeated assurances by those in control of the Government that the tariff per se and of necessity is to strike the shackles from business.

Mr. President, if business disaster prematurely comes, its coming will be due more to the oft-expressed fears of this administration than to any efforts by wicked business men, who as patriots are expected to be happy the while their business is threatened with destruction and themselves with prosecution.

There is one thing which stands out clearly at this time and that is this: The administration would be supremely happy if it was well assured that the condition of the country would be no worse than it is to-day. It has no real hope that things will be better; it justly fears they will be worse, and it is looking everywhere for some scapegoat for its own handiwork.

This measure for the first time in our history disclaims the principle of protection. Whatever protection is in the bill is purely incidental, although from its sectional character I can not say that it is accidental. There is too much method disclosed for accident. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, in speaking for the majority members of his committee, stated that no attention had been given to the question of cost of production. That is but one illustration of the foregoing statement that protection had been ignored, for the true principle of protection is founded on difference in cost of production here and abroad. He clearly demonstrated that the one publicly declared reason for the revision made is a desire to cheapen the cost of articles to the consumer. Now, Mr. President, things must be cheapened to the consumer or this legislation must result in failure and its creators will be condemned, and if it does cheapen consumption it must not be done at the expense of general prosperity or by reducing the ability of the people to purchase. There is but one possible theory on which goods can be cheapened in price and general prosperity maintained by the reductions in tariff proposed in this bill, and that is that the profits of the manufacturer and the farmer are so large that they can be reduced to meet foreign competition and further that the consumer will get the benefit of such reduction. Is it within reason to suppose that our farmers and manufacturers are as a whole enjoying extraordinary and unreasonable profits?

The records do not so disclose. It is possible that some of our largest concerns who produce vast quantities of goods at a small profit per unit may continue to do business, but the great majority of the business of manufacture and agriculture is conducted at so small a margin of profit that it can not continue if that margin is reduced. The large concern may endure through the temporary reign of Democracy. It may be able to cooperate with its foreign competitors so as to do business, but is that to be the policy of Democracy? The trend of the times is against monopoly.

Is there any assurance that a reduction of the tariff will be reflected in retail prices? It was not so reflected in the retail price of shoes when in 1909 hides were put on the free list and the duties on shoes was reduced 75 per cent. Lumber was not lessened in price to the consumer when the tariff was reduced one-half. But it is possible to reduce the retail price of things. It was done in 1893 to 1897. General industrial depression is absolutely sure to reduce retail prices. Close the factories of this country, destroy in a measure home production, and the thousands of wage earners and small business men who furnish the best market for the products of agriculture and industry will be compelled to reduce their consumption and these products will outrun the demand and their price will drop. But what will it profit a man if the price of food and raiment is small if he has not the power to purchase?

The distinguished chairman, Mr. SIMMONS, frankly admits that the bill is intended to permit the importation of more foreign goods. Who is to make these imported goods? Foreign labor, which in no place on earth, save possibly in Canada, receives more than 50 per cent as high wages as in the United States, will produce them if they are used at all. These imported goods will be made abroad, and therefore can not be made at home, and so far as they at least are concerned American labor will be denied the opportunity to work. The distinguished Senator, however, speaking for his Democratic colleagues, suggests that while our home market, which is the best on earth, may have to be surrendered in a measure to the foreigner, markets abroad will be opened to us. But again, what shall it profit our people to give up the best on earth for the hope of gaining a greater chance at the markets of the world in competition with the monopoly-encouraged, bounty-fed products of other countries?

Mr. President, this bill is inspired by antagonism to American prosperity. Trusts and monopolies are the expressed objects of attack, but every legitimate industry is subject to Democracy's destructive fire, and in its ostensible efforts to injure the bad it recklessly and wantonly destroys the good. We can and should destroy domestic monopoly, and great progress has been made in that direction; but the policy of free trade is a blow to all domestic business conducted under the American conditions of wages and living and opens the door to destruction by possible foreign trusts and monopolies, under whose tyranny this Government would be helpless.

We can rid our barns of rats without burning the buildings. We can cut off all special tariff favors without destroying the opportunities for American labor and enterprise.

The distinguished chairman has stated as a fact that some things upon which a tariff is now levied cost no more to produce here than in the competing foreign countries. Unfortunately I and other Senators of the minority have not been privileged to hear the arguments which have led the Senator to his conclusions, but if it is true that such duties do exist, then I certainly would favor reducing them to a minimum, which would be an amount sufficient to protect against the possible inundation of our markets for the temporary purpose of destroying home production.

I voted for Canadian reciprocity, so called, and in doing so I am now aware that I made a political mistake. I was confident at that time that the reciprocal arrangement thus proposed would unite the two countries, of common ancestry, of similar conditions as to wages and living, by closer ties of common interests. I felt that the waterways which lie along the boundary and which belonged to both nations should have their mighty possibilities developed for those nations' common good, and it seemed to me that the agreement for mutual benefits might be helpful to that great purpose. Since reciprocity was defeated, however, the United States Senate has passed a resolution authorizing the President to enter into treaty relations with Canada for this purpose. I did not, however, rightly interpret the sentiment either of our own people or that of the Canadians. Many of the men and papers who supported President Taft in his efforts for Canadian reciprocity afterwards were either silent when he was attacked for urging the pact or else they openly condemned him for his efforts. Canada repudiated the action of this Government and defeated the agreement when the matter came before her people. Since that action by Canada I have taken every opportunity to reverse the vote by which Congress passed the measure, and I felt then, as I do now, that no form of Canadian reciprocity will ever again receive my support unless Canada shall have first passed and presented the proposal and the American people shall have given it their approval. And yet, here is a proposition to give to Canada all and more than was offered under the reciprocity act without asking anything in return, and the same privilege is extended to every nation on earth where cost of production and conditions of living are greatly below those maintaining in the United States.

No tariff bill was ever presented to Congress so unjustly discriminatory against the northern and western farmer, and yet its advocates have the temerity to say that the farmer will be benefited by subjecting him without any protection to the competition of the world. If the farmer resented reciprocity, what will he say to this measure which sacrifices everything and obtains nothing?

It might be interesting to take up in detail and discuss the items of this bill, but it would be unavailing so far as changing the decree which has gone out to the effect that it must pass without change, and the country is impatient for the final vote.

I could call attention to numerous cases where in this bill the foreign producer has been placed not on an equality simply with

American producers, but where he has been given a direct and material advantage over them. I could point out many provisions in which duties are raised upon articles which do not and could not compete with American products and which therefore without question increase the cost to the consumer by the full amount of the duty and that without conferring even an incidental benefit upon a single American. I could specify items which will result in placing our people in the hopeless grasp of foreign monopolies over which our Government can exercise no control.

I could refer to instances which show the potential in not compete with American products and which therefore without let or hindrance the American people. I could show that the policy and result of this measure is to place this great Republic at the mercy of other nations for some of the very necessities of life, such as sugar, wool, meat, and flour. Other civilized countries have felt that it was the height of wisdom to become and remain independent of every other nation so far as necessities are concerned. Swords have not yet been beaten into plowshares nor spears into pruning hooks, and even as the rumbling of international trouble disturbs our ears it is proposed that we shall make our Republic dependent upon foreign nations for those things which are necessary to its existence in peace and war. But, Mr. President, many of these things have already been disclosed and others will be specified as we progress with the consideration of the bill. I am sorry that the Senate is foreclosed from effecting changes which unfettered patriotic judgment dictates as right. I can only hope that my fears are groundless and that American peace, prosperity, and progress will continue.

I have the honor to represent in part one of the greatest States in this Union of great States. Her agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and lumbering interests are of mighty importance not only to her people but to the people of the whole country. In patriotism and love of country she is unsurpassed by any other. She sent more than her full quota of her best citizens to help preserve the Union. More than were needed of her loyal sons presented themselves at McKinley's call for men to maintain the Nation's honor in the War with Spain. She is ready at all times, as she has been in the past, to do everything which becomes a liberty-loving, patriotic Commonwealth to contribute to the stability and greatness of the United States. She asks no favors which she is not willing to accord to every other State; but she insists that this country, with all of the resources and possibilities which have been bestowed by a bountiful Providence upon her shall be held and developed primarily by and for the American people. She believes in benefiting the world, but that such benefit shall be given not by lowering American standards to that of the lowest competitor, but through such a beneficent administration of national affairs as will attract to us the eyes of all nations, who will here see and emulate the glorious possibilities of a Government not only of and by, but for its own people. She would not equalize world conditions by degrading our people to a lower level, but through example would inspire others to raise themselves. As an humble representative of such a State I protest against the enactment into law of a bill inspired by prejudice, framed in darkness, and with no possibilities for good to any American except the importer who sells foreign-made goods and the retired capitalist, who neither toils nor spins and who, contrary to Divine injunction, takes his only care for what he shall eat and drink and wear. This Government should be interested more largely in opportunities for doing and being than in the chances for simply existing.

Mr. President, I can see no good that will come to the American people by the enactment of this bill into law. It contains some things which I would be willing to support if I could vote upon them divorced from their caucus-forged bonds to other provisions which I regard as dangerous not only to our revenues but to our prosperity. I shall support such amendments as are offered which, in my judgment, will improve the measure. If every Senator would vote his honest convictions we would be able to remedy some of its glaring defects; but believing as I do that the measure as a whole is wrongly based and inimical to the progress, prosperity, and happiness of my countrymen, I shall vote against it on its final passage, and I am now ready to perform that duty.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in his able defensive speech on the pending bill the chairman of the Finance Committee sought to justify the drift of the bill toward free trade by citing the result of the last presidential election. The tariff, he said, was the paramount issue in the campaign, and out of the 531 votes in the electoral college President Taft received only 8, and Mr. Wilson received 435.

The bill now before the Senate, Chairman SIMMONS contends, is "a fair interpretation of the will of the people."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], also a prominent and distinguished member of the Finance Committee, in some remarks submitted a few days ago seemed to take the same ground when he claimed that the so-called Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act had nothing to do with the panic which followed; that the American people have since found out that any statement to that effect was a lie—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to ask the Senator if I understood him to use the words "panic which followed"?

Mr. WARREN. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Senator intend to use the word "followed," or did he intend to say "which preceded"?

Mr. WARREN. I intended to use it as I have said it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wanted to know.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Mississippi claimed that he was authorized to so state "by the authority of the last election, which put Woodrow Wilson in the White House."

PARTY PLATFORMS—1912.

Now, Mr. President, the facts are that three great political conventions were held last year, each of the three political parties adopting a platform of principles on which it sought the votes of the people. As to the tariff, the several declarations of principles were, in effect, as follows:

Republican: Maintenance of a protective tariff, with a reduction of duties that may be too high and with a general readjustment of duties by means of accurate information obtained by an expert commission.

Progressive Republican: A protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

Democratic: A tariff for revenue only, on the ground that a protective tariff is unconstitutional.

To soften this declaration, notwithstanding the solemn assurance of our friend the Senator from Mississippi that the people no longer believe that harm can come from destroying the protective-tariff system, the Democratic platform contained these words:

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

To further allay the fears of the American people that the success of the Democratic Party would mean the destruction of the protective system of tariff legislation, Mr. Wilson, the then candidate, now President, in his speech at Pittsburgh on October 18, said:

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country. * * * They will not undertake the task like amateurs, either. They will seek and obtain the best possible advice in the country, but they will seek it far and wide and not only in the quarters from which it has usually come.

Without stopping here to comment upon the atrocious betrayal of these ante-election promises by the Democratic Party and its nominee for President, and its President, as evidenced in the bill now before us, which confessedly will "destroy legitimate industry" in striking down the sugar and wool and other industries, we pass on, and find that, so far as the tariff is concerned, the Republicans and the Progressive Republicans were practically as one party in the last campaign. Any Republican would have been content to have the Progressive tariff plank substituted for that of his own party, and the Progressives would have been content with the Republican tariff plank. Consequently, in voting on the tariff the two parties might well be considered as united.

HOW THE PEOPLE VOTED.

The returns show that of the popular vote of the country—

	Votes.
Mr. Taft, on a protective platform, received.....	3,484,520
Mr. Roosevelt, on a protective platform, received.....	4,123,206
Total for protection.....	7,607,726
Mr. Wilson, on a tariff-for-revenue platform, received.....	6,290,818
Majority of protection votes over tariff-for-revenue votes.....	1,316,917

Surely a very handsome majority.

Had the votes for protection, over those for a revenue tariff, decided the election of electors, Mr. Wilson instead of receiving 435 votes in the electoral college would have received but 152, or only a little more than one-third as many.

Had the electoral vote, by States, been decided upon the numbers cast for protection and the numbers cast for a revenue tariff, the result would have been like this:

	Electoral vote.	Wilson.	Roosevelt.	Taft.
For a revenue tariff:				
Alabama	12	82,438	22,680	9,732
Arizona	3	10,324	6,951	2,986
Arkansas	9	68,838	21,673	24,467
Florida	6	36,417	4,535	4,279
Georgia	14	92,076	21,980	5,181
Kentucky	13	219,584	102,766	115,512
Louisiana	10	60,971	9,323	3,834
Mississippi	10	57,227	8,645	1,595
North Carolina	12	144,507	69,130	29,139
Oklahoma	10	119,156	1,293	90,786
South Carolina	9	48,357	1,293	536
Tennessee	12	130,275	63,710	59,392
Texas	20	219,489	26,745	25,830
Virginia	12	60,332	21,777	23,288
Total (14 States)	152			
For a protective tariff:				
California	13	283,486	283,610	3,914
Colorado	6	114,232	72,306	58,386
Connecticut	7	74,561	34,129	68,324
Delaware	3	22,631	8,886	15,997
Idaho	4	33,921	25,527	32,810
Illinois	29	405,848	386,478	253,593
Indiana	15	281,890	162,007	151,267
Iowa	13	185,325	161,819	119,805
Kansas	10	143,663	120,210	74,845
Maine	6	51,113	48,495	26,545
Maryland	8	112,674	57,789	54,956
Massachusetts	18	173,408	142,228	155,948
Michigan	15	150,751	214,584	152,244
Minnesota	12	106,426	125,856	64,334
Missouri	18	330,746	124,371	207,821
Montana	4	27,941	22,456	18,512
Nebraska	8	109,008	72,614	54,216
Nevada	3	7,986	5,620	3,196
New Hampshire	4	34,724	17,794	32,927
New Jersey	14	178,289	145,410	88,835
New Mexico	3	20,437	8,347	17,733
New York	45	655,475	390,021	455,428
North Dakota	5	29,555	25,726	23,090
Ohio	24	423,153	229,327	277,066
Oregon	5	47,064	37,600	34,673
Pennsylvania	38	395,619	447,426	273,305
Rhode Island	5	30,412	16,878	27,703
South Dakota	5	48,982	58,811
Utah	4	36,579	24,174	42,100
Vermont	4	15,354	22,132	23,332
Washington	7	86,840	113,698	70,445
West Virginia	8	113,046	78,977	56,667
Wisconsin	13	164,228	62,460	130,695
Wyoming	3	15,310	9,232	14,560
Total (34 States)	379			

Two and one-half times as many electoral votes for a protective tariff presidential candidate as for a revenue tariff candidate.

And so free trade or tariff for revenue only received the indorsement of but 14 out of 48 States, while a protective tariff was adhered to by 34 States—more than two-thirds of the States in number. And it is also a significant fact that of those free-trade or tariff-for-revenue-only States, 12 of them were the old solid South, rock-ribbed, always-that-way States, the other 2 being the newer States of Oklahoma and Arizona; while on the other hand all of the old northern and western group that have ever heretofore declared for a protective tariff, and including the southern States of Maryland, Missouri, and West Virginia and the new State of New Mexico, 34 in all, recorded their votes for protection.

So it is idle to claim that the people of this country are clamoring for a change from protection to free trade or a tariff for revenue only.

Taking it another way: In point of population the States voting for the revenue-tariff idea contain the following:

Alabama	2,138,093
Arizona	204,354
Arkansas	1,574,449
Florida	752,619
Georgia	2,609,121
Kentucky	2,289,905
Louisiana	1,656,388
Mississippi	1,797,114
North Carolina	2,206,287
Oklahoma	1,657,155
South Carolina	1,515,400
Tennessee	2,184,789
Texas	3,896,542
Virginia	2,061,612
Total (14 States)	26,543,828

The States casting a majority vote for the protective idea have a population as follows:

California	2,377,549
Colorado	799,024
Connecticut	1,114,756

Delaware	202,322
Idaho	325,594
Illinois	5,638,591
Indiana	2,700,876
Iowa	2,224,771
Kansas	1,690,949
Maine	742,371
Maryland	1,295,346
Massachusetts	3,366,416
Michigan	2,810,173
Minnesota	2,075,708
Missouri	3,293,335
Montana	376,053
Nebraska	1,192,214
Nevada	81,875
New Hampshire	430,572
New Jersey	2,537,167
New Mexico	327,301
New York	9,113,614
North Dakota	577,056
Ohio	4,767,121
Oregon	672,765
Pennsylvania	7,665,111
Rhode Island	542,010
South Dakota	583,888
Utah	373,351
Vermont	355,956
Washington	1,141,990
West Virginia	1,221,119
Wisconsin	2,333,860
Wyoming	145,965

Total (34 States)..... 65,097,369

Thus the vote for the revenue-tariff idea represents but twenty-six and a half millions of our people, while the vote for the protective idea represents sixty-five millions, speaking in round numbers.

Carrying the point a step further, we find from the latest available statistics that the estimated true value of all property in 1904 in the 14 tariff-for-revenue States was as follows:

Alabama	\$965,014,261
Arizona	306,302,305
Arkansas	803,907,972
Florida	431,409,200
Georgia	1,167,445,671
Kentucky	1,527,486,230
Louisiana	1,032,299,006
Mississippi	688,249,022
North Carolina	842,072,218
Oklahoma and Indian Territory	459,021,355
South Carolina	636,013,700
Tennessee	585,853,222
Texas	1,104,223,979
Virginia	2,836,322,003
Total	14,673,520,324

The estimated true value of all property in the 34 protective-tariff-voting States in 1904 was:

California	\$4,115,491,106
Colorado	1,207,542,107
Connecticut	1,414,635,063
Delaware	230,260,976
Idaho	342,871,863
Illinois	8,816,556,191
Indiana	3,105,781,739
Iowa	4,048,516,076
Kansas	2,253,224,243
Maine	775,622,722
Maryland	1,511,488,172
Massachusetts	4,956,578,913
Michigan	3,282,419,117
Minnesota	3,343,722,076
Missouri	3,759,597,451
Montana	746,311,213
Nebraska	2,009,563,633
Nevada	220,734,507
New Hampshire	516,809,204
New Jersey	3,235,619,973
New Mexico	332,262,650
New York	14,769,042,207
North Dakota	735,802,909
Ohio	5,946,969,466
Oregon	852,053,232
Pennsylvania	11,473,620,306
Rhode Island	799,349,601
South Dakota	679,840,939
Utah	487,768,615
Vermont	360,330,089
Washington	1,051,671,432
West Virginia	840,000,149
Wisconsin	2,838,678,239
Wyoming	329,572,241
Total	91,390,308,420

Thus it will be seen that the relative standing in the country of the protective-tariff and the revenue-tariff ideas is as follows:

	Revenue tariff.	Protective tariff.
Electoral votes.....	152	379
Population.....	26,543,828	65,097,369
Property value.....	\$14,673,520,324	\$91,390,308,420

Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent from the discussion so far of the pending tariff measure that the opinions of Senators are as widely apart, almost, as the poles, relative to the subject, between those who believe in protection so placed as to be practically a tariff for revenue also and those who oppose protection and insist upon a tariff for revenue only, not even willing to have incidental protection, but instead a tariff so placed, much of it, that neither protection nor any considerable revenue can result.

I myself am a believer in a protective tariff, and wish at all times to be counted upon that side of the equation.

If a line of conduct or belief has led invariably to success, we should credit it accordingly. And in my own opinion, if I have read history correctly and have observed events with care, it is safe for me to assert that an adequate protective tariff has brought us prosperity and consequent happiness, while a free-trade policy—or its first cousin or nearer relative, a tariff for revenue only—has invariably brought us into nonprosperous times and consequent sorrow.

Notwithstanding the fact that the subject of the tariff is old and has been talked about and thought of much by all of us, yet from the very nature of things it is never shopworn nor outlawed. It is always with us, and must necessarily be with us so long as we have a Government and the Government is supported in whole or in part from the levying of taxes, directly or indirectly.

Pursued as I am, and as doubtless others are, by inquiries as to what the pending bill contains and how it compares with former bills, and by many requests for some history concerning the numerous bills which have been enacted during the life of the Republic, I have thought it best to prepare and put into the RECORD a sort of brief résumé of the leading and important tariff measures, with facts and comments as to tariff legislation according to my views, even though it may smack a little of the elementary.

It was very early in the history of our Republic when the doctrine of protection found a place in our laws. The State of Pennsylvania in 1785 enacted a protective tariff law imposing specific duties on articles imported into the State from abroad and ad valorem duties on others. It was intended to encourage manufacturing within the State, and so well did it fulfill this intention that Pennsylvania to this day has been an advocate of the protective idea. The Pennsylvania law was the model for the first tariff law enacted by the Federal Government, in 1789.

FIRST NATIONAL PROTECTIVE LAW.

The date of the first protective tariff law, July 4, 1789, is significant, and the language of section 1 of the act is equally so. It is:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported: Be it enacted, etc.

Protective legislation in connection with laws for protection to American shipping brought immediate prosperity to the young Nation, paid the expenses of the Government, and enabled it, by 1834-35, to wipe out the national debt, including the \$15,000,000 paid for the purchase of Louisiana.

Various revisions of the first tariff law were made in the period between July 4, 1789, and the War of 1812, none of them downward and most of them upward. Conditions improved wonderfully during this period, and the transformation from household industry to an organized system of factories was begun.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go very deeply into ancient history; but in order to make some comparisons and to show some coincidences I shall trespass upon the time of the Senate for a few moments to touch upon some of the high points from that period up to the present time.

Census reports for 1810 show that the manufactured products of the country aggregated \$127,694,602, the growth of but a few years under protection.

During the progress of the War of 1812 a tariff practically prohibitive was in force, and this extreme application of the protective idea threw the people of the country on their own resources, and establishments for the manufacture of cotton goods, woolen cloth, iron, glass, pottery, and other articles increased in number wonderfully.

A report of conditions in the United States at the close of the war, made by Mathew Carey, showed that employment was at hand for every man, woman, and child able and willing to work, cotton manufactures aggregating \$24,000,000 annually; woolen manufactures, \$19,000,000; all manufacturing establishments busy; money easy; debts collected without difficulty, and the country generally prosperous except in a few places which suffered desolation during the war,

After the close of the war the prohibitive war duties were reduced by temporary legislation 29 per cent; and then followed the act of April 27, 1816, which was not as protective as the advocates of that policy desired.

It is worthy of notice that one of the strongest advocates of the protective-tariff idea at the time this bill was under consideration was John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, and one of his speeches was the most notable effort of the session in favor of protection.

INADEQUATE TARIFF BRINGS DISASTER.

The inadequate protective duties of the act of 1816 opened the way for an onslaught on American markets and industries by Great Britain which proved more injurious to this country than a successful war would have been. First came a brief period of fictitious prosperity in which floods of foreign goods at low prices came into the country, bringing on extravagant speculation in business. Then came liquidation and bankruptcy to the merchant and farmer.

Thomas H. Benton, writing of that period, said:

No price for property, no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal, no employment for industry, no demand for labor, no sale for the produce of the farm, no sound of the hammer, except that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Distress was the universal cry of the people; relief, the universal demand, was thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and Federal.

How accurately this description fits a later period of depression which most of us remember, namely, the depression caused by the Wilson-Gorman law.

The iron trade, the pottery industry, the glass factories, the manufactures of cotton goods, the woolen industry—all were hard hit. England glutted the markets of this country with cheap goods and nearly ruined us.

The hard times of that early period were attributed by the free-trade advocates to the failure of banks and the decrease of currency, just as the free traders of to-day blame the panic and hard times of 1893-1897 on former President Cleveland and the banks as per Senator THOMAS a few days ago.

A memorial to Congress adopted by a convention in which delegates participated from nine States contained the following statement showing the unfortunate condition of the manufacturing industries:

While so many of our manufactures are thus ruined, our working people destitute of employment and of the means to support their families, our cities and towns are filled with the manufactured productions of other nations, by which we have been and are ruinously drained of our wealth. That these complicated evils which oppress us and which have taken place during a season of profound peace of nearly five years' duration, after a war closed with honor, which left us in a state of high prosperity, evince that there is something radically unsound in our policy which requires a radical remedy in the power of the National Legislature alone to supply.

COUNTRY DEMANDS PROTECTION.

The demand for a remedy was met by Congress with the passage of the protective-tariff act of May 22, 1824, and the still more highly protective act of May 19, 1828, the latter act remaining in force five years.

Under the operations of those two tariff laws prosperity returned to the country, manufacturing was revived, work was abundant, and the public debt was rapidly wiped out of existence.

Henry Clay, in a speech delivered in 1832, said that if a term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity enjoyed by the people since the establishment of the Constitution it would be exactly that period which immediately followed the passage of the tariff act of 1824.

The history of our country shows that oftentimes prosperity as well as adversity brings discontent.

Under the protective tariffs of 1824 and 1828 there was universal prosperity and, as stated, the revenues of the Government exceeded the expenditures to such an extent that the public debt was paid and a surplus of funds in the Treasury was being accumulated. To reduce revenue and avoid the dangers of a great surplus revision of the tariff was urged. It was contended that the tariffs of 1824 and 1828 imposed duties on many fabrics and commodities not made in the United States and thus imposed unnecessary burdens of taxation on the people.

It was during this period of discussion that the consideration of the tariff question lost its economic features and took on a political and sectional side, which seems to have ever since characterized it.

The antagonism between the North and South was becoming more and more marked, radical free trade being advocated generally by southern statesmen and protection by those from the North.

The questions involved in slavery entered into the consideration of the tariff, so that tariff became one of the acute political issues of the time.

One outcome of the controversy was Henry Clay's famous "compromise" tariff act of 1833, which reduced rates of duty

and provided for a sliding scale of further reductions and ultimate free trade in a large number of articles.

That act greatly increased the importation of foreign goods, which were forced into our markets, sold at auction and on liberal terms of credit to merchants and speculators, whose commercial paper was taken and discounted by the banks. The imports increased from \$108,609,700 in 1834 to \$176,579,154 in 1836, and the balance of trade for the four years of 1834 to 1837, inclusive, was \$99,168,104 against us.

DEPRESSION FOLLOWS TARIFF REDUCTION.

The panic of 1837 told the same story of depression as that following the tariff reduction of 1816. The American market was overwhelmed; domestic production displaced; the labor and industries of the country disorganized; the people impoverished and their purchasing power destroyed. Then followed diminished importations, loss of revenue, and universal financial embarrassment. The Treasury became practically bankrupt. Receipts fell below expenditures year by year and were replenished by increasing the national debt.

The balance of trade against the country and consequent exportation of specie brought on a financial panic in which a great many of the banks of the country were obliged to suspend specie payments.

As usual, and as now, the defenders of the low-tariff and free-trade policies attributed the hard times and panic to the bankers, when, in fact, the banks were victims, with others, of the adoption of a tariff system not in accord with our industrial and business life.

The condition of the country as it existed before protection was restored is described in Hunt's Merchants' Magazine for 1842, page 482, as follows:

These continually accumulated disasters down to the 1st of April had thrown a degree of gloom over the commercial circles seldom witnessed. The heavy spring payments had been falling due; remittances from the country could not be obtained; the banks were fearful of extending themselves in the smallest degree; goods could scarcely be sold for money at any price; the accounts for abroad gave but little indication of a speedy revival and of a demand for American produce; and the sluggish and uncertain action of Congress tended to enhance the dread of the future.

In Colton's Life of Henry Clay, volume 1, is this deplorable picture:

The revulsion of 1837 provided a far greater havoc than was experienced in the free-trade period of 1820 and 1824. The ruin came quick and fearful. They were few that could save themselves. Property of every description was parted with at prices that were astounding, and as for currency, there was scarcely any at all.

The Government failed in efforts to place a loan of \$12,000,000 in Europe, and in response to advertisements for a popular loan only \$250,000 was offered, at rates ranging from 28 per cent to 32 per cent per annum. The American Almanac estimated the losses during that depression in six leading lines of trade at \$785,000,000. Over 30,000 merchants went into bankruptcy, and 50,000 settled with creditors, who sustained losses of \$250,000,000.

The country returned to the protective policy in 1842, when the act of August 30 restored protective duties, substituting on many articles specific for ad valorem rates.

Of that tariff act John Quincy Adams said:

The tariff of 1842 has wrought wonders for the purposes for which it was enacted—the procurement of an adequate revenue and protection for the native industry and free labor of the land. It has fully performed its promise in the production of revenue. It has restored the palsied credit of the Nation, filled the coffers of the Treasury, and has already paid off a large proportion of the heavy debt contracted by the preceding administration.

A New York paper in November, 1842, said:

When the tariff bill was passed imposing a greater duty on foreign goods it was alleged by most men that it would increase the price of foreign articles nearly or quite to the amount of the duty, and then it would be an indirect tax on the people. Contrary to this prediction, the fact has turned out differently.

The flourishing condition of the country which immediately followed enabled the people to increase their purchases of all kinds of commodities, domestic as well as foreign. Although the importation of protected articles diminished, those of the noncompetitive classes, upon which the duties operated simply for revenue, so increased, owing to the general prosperity of the country, that the Treasury soon held a surplus. Before the act of 1842 was superseded by the act of 1846 \$15,000,000 was paid on the national debt.

In contrast with the adverse balance of trade of \$99,168,104 against us in the four years 1834 to 1837, there was a trade balance in our favor of \$28,000,000 for the four protective-tariff years 1843 to 1846, inclusive.

William D. Kelley said in his speech before Congress January 3, 1866:

When the tariff of 1842 went into effect our country was being flooded with British manufactures of every variety, from a tennypenny nail to a circular saw, and from table cutlery to butt hinges, thumb latches, etc. But when 1847 came around four years of adequate pro-

tection had so stimulated the skill and ingenuity of Americans and had brought from Great Britain so many skilled workmen that our own market was ours for at least an infinite variety of hardware, and we have held it in many departments of the business from that day to this, no one being able to undersell us in our own streets.

While the act remained in force only four years and three months and was the last protective measure in operation until the Republican Party restored and extended the policy in 1861, it operated to so strengthen established industries and to give others a firm foothold that they were able, by retrenchment, the practice of great economy, reduction of wages, and extension of working hours, to better withstand the severe competition to which they were subjected from 1846 to 1860.

Efforts to repeal the 1842 protective law were made in 1844 and failed. Speaking in opposition to a change in the tariff at that time, Senator Berrien, of Georgia, said there had been since August, 1842, a sensible improvement in the condition of the country; whether because of that tariff or in spite of it was not the subject of his inquiry. He stated the following facts:

1. The credit of the country was prostrate and has been redeemed. Its stock is again above par.
2. The Treasury was empty; it is now replenished.
3. The commerce and navigation of the country have increased.
4. Its agricultural condition has improved.
5. There has been a marked improvement of our great staples.
6. A reduction in the prices of almost all if not absolutely of every article of consumption.
7. To crown the whole, every branch of industry has been stimulated to increased activity, and confidence has been restored.

The presidential election of 1844, resulting in the defeat of Henry Clay, protectionist, and the election of James K. Polk, free-trader, brought the era of protection to an end until it was restored in 1861. The Walker tariff law, based on the theory of a revenue tariff, went into effect December 1, 1846, and remained in force until July 1, 1857, when duties were further reduced to harmonize with the revenue standard, and a material change was made in the principles of the Walker tariff by placing many raw materials on the free list.

During the period those tariff laws were in operation a problem of greater importance—that of slavery—occupied the attention of the country, and the relative merits of protection and free trade were placed in the background.

Nevertheless the revenue tariff of 1846, which practically placed manufactures on the free list while retaining duties on raw material, was the cause of increasing importations of competing manufactures, the reduction of wages, and the surrender of profits.

Thus the correcting of one error by making a second one did not bring success. The first error was taxed raw materials and free manufactures; the second, free raw materials and taxed manufactures, neither of which theories can be accepted as correct. A true protective theory requires an adequate tariff on both raw materials and manufactures. A free-trade policy, to be consistent, must naturally demand that both shall be free.

The culmination was the panic of 1857, when, through the exhaustion of the country, trade declined, the sales of public land almost stopped, and the revenues of the Government receded below the expenditures. The depression of business continued until 1861. The balance of foreign trade against us for the four years 1857 to 1860, inclusive, amounted to \$169,555,444. The national debt was increased from \$45,000,000 in 1847 to \$90,000,000 in 1861. The credit of the Government was poor, and bonds offered by President Buchanan in 1860 brought practically no offers, while an issue of Treasury notes were bid for at from 12 to 30 per cent discount.

In his message of December 14, 1860, President Buchanan said:

Panic and distress of a fearful character prevail throughout the land. Our laboring population is without employment, and consequently deprived of the means of earning their bread. Indeed, all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

In fact, I think there may be Senators now in this body who can recall the pinching times of the Buchanan administration and can remember the poor credit of our Government at that time.

And yet the country was operating under the most anti-protective tariff law ever enacted, a law based upon the views and report of President Polk's Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, the ablest opponent of the policy of protection the country has produced.

The test of that law was made under favorable conditions. When it was enacted the country was enjoying an amazing degree of prosperity and business enlargement. The discovery of gold in California, the construction of thousands of miles of railroad, the opening to settlement of millions of acres of land in the Mississippi Valley and beyond, all contributed to keep capital invested and labor employed. Had it not been

for these extraordinary aids to commerce and business the revenue system doubtless would have broken down long before 1857.

The conspicuous results of the Walker tariff between 1846 and 1860 were that wages of labor were not increased, but reduced. Not a single new competitive industry was established in the country. The importations of manufactured articles greatly increased. The exports of gold to settle the adverse balance of trade impoverished the country and caused the business depression of 1857-1860.

The protective element obtained control of Congress in 1860 and a protective tariff bill was passed March 2, 1861, receiving President Buchanan's signature shortly before his retirement from office. This bill provided for a moderate increase of ad valorem rates but changed many duties from ad valorem to specific. The act did not provide enough revenue to meet the extraordinary expenses of the Civil War and the rates were increased at a special session of Congress in August, 1861.

It is worthy of note that during this period one of the most effective advocates of protection was a northern Democrat, William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, once a free trader but converted to protection by observing himself the effect of the two policies on the business of the country.

In his introduction to his published speeches and addresses, Mr. Kelley said:

The theory that labor—the productive exercise of the skill and muscular power of men, who are responsible for the faithful and intelligent performance of civic and other duties—is merely a raw material, and that the Nation which pays least for it is the wisest and best governed, is inadmissible, in a democracy; and when we shall determine to starve the bodies and minds of our operatives in order that we may successfully compete in common markets with the productions of the underpaid and poorly fed peasants of Europe, and the paupers of England, we shall assail the foundations of a Government which rests upon the intelligence and integrity of its people. To defend our country against this result is the office of a protective tariff, and for this duty it alone is sufficient.

It was during this period of a protective tariff that the country prospered in the face of a financial panic. The panic of 1873 was short lived and was followed by a period of great industrial prosperity and growth. The wealth of the country, 1873-1879, increased 44 per cent. The manufactures of the country increased 27 per cent. Iron and steel production increased 200 per cent. Railroad mileage increased 40,000 miles. The national debt was reduced by \$322,462,622.

In his speech delivered December 8, 1881, Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, said:

In six years ending June 30, 1881, our exports of merchandise exceeded imports by over \$1,175,000,000—a large sum in itself, largely increasing our stock of gold, filling the pockets of the people with more than two hundred and fifty millions, not found in the Treasury or banks, making the return to specie payment easy, and arresting the painful drain of interest so long paid abroad. It is also a very conclusive refutation of the free-trade chimeras that exports are dependent upon imports, and that comparatively high duties are invariably less productive of revenue than low duties. The pertinent question arises, Shall we not in the main hold fast to the blessings we have?

A surplus in the Treasury invited reductions in the tariff and downward revision was enacted in the law of March 3, 1883.

It was thought by the protectionists that if concessions were made tariff agitation would cease, and that act contained reductions and compromises which proved unsatisfactory in that they injured the industries affected. The act was a general downward revision of the tariff, an increased free list, and its effect on a number of industries was disastrous.

The act of October 1, 1890, the McKinley Act, was a complete and practical revision of the tariff. Many changes were made from ad valorem to specific rates. The free list was enlarged. The McKinley Act was in force four years, during which there was unusual prosperity in all lines of industry in the country. Employment was plentiful and wages were high.

The history of that period again shows that prosperity as well as adversity breeds discontent.

The Cleveland administration, with antiprotection control of Senate and House, came into power, and its most noted achievement was the Wilson-Gorman Act of August 27, 1894.

It is needless to recite here the conditions of the country which attended the passage and administration of the Wilson-Gorman law. Its scars have not been entirely effaced even by the lapse of nearly a score of years of prosperity. That the country was prostrated, business almost annihilated, factories and works closed, real estate depreciated in value, work denied millions of men willing to work, wages reduced to a mere pittance is not denied. But that the depression was due to the effect of the Wilson-Gorman law is now denied by the opponents of the protective-tariff system, the latest explanation of the depression being, as stated by the Senator from Colorado

[Mr. THOMAS], that it was the result of a conspiracy between President Cleveland and Wall Street.

It is certain, however, that no financial panic could cause the general misfortunes which visited the country during Mr. Cleveland's second administration and continued until the enactment of a protective-tariff law was insured by the election of Mr. McKinley and a protective-tariff Congress.

This brief review of tariff legislation in our country—by no means a complete review, but simply a mention of the salient features of tariff legislation preceding the Dingley Act—brings into view the fact that coincident with all legislation along the lines of free trade or revenue tariff this country has suffered from depressions in business, stoppage of manufacturing, dearth of work for all classes of workingmen, increase of importations of manufactured articles, disarrangement of the finances of the Government, and what may be generally classed as "hard times."

On the other hand, coincident with the periods of protective legislation, there have been generally prosperous conditions, ample work, increased wages, growth in manufacturing, growth in agriculture and stock raising, generally sound financial conditions, and general "good times."

Without insisting that the hard-times periods of our history were due absolutely to the low tariffs of the same periods or that the good-times periods were caused by high tariffs, I contend that it is nevertheless significant that adversity has attended one and prosperity the other.

Conditions at the present time are similar to what they have been many times in the past, and while I hope history is not to repeat itself, I confess that I am apprehensive that the causes which operated so disastrously in our case in the past will have the same effect when again applied.

I earnestly hope that our experiences under this legislation will show that protection has built up our industries and commerce to such a plane of stability that we can withstand the flood of competing goods from all parts of the world which are being now accumulated to pour in upon our home market as soon as the barrier of protection is removed by the enactment of the pending bill.

We shall have to contend with sugar from Cuba and Java; wool from Australia and Argentina; coal from Canada; fruits from Italy; manufactures of all kinds from England and Germany and, perhaps, Japan; cattle and meats from Mexico, Argentina, Australia, and Canada—in fact, we shall have to defend our market from unequal competition directed against us from every quarter of the globe.

I shall not predict that we can not withstand the onslaught that will be made against us, for I have faith in the ability of the American people to cope with every misfortune and every adversity which they may be called upon to face.

I do not want to be a prophet of evil, but at the same time I feel that the experiences of this country as a result of low-tariff or revenue-tariff legislation and consequent reduction of compensation of labor have been sufficiently distressing to justify the apprehension, anxiety, and distrust in the future of our business and commercial interests.

There is this light in the situation: The American people are quick of discernment and quick to act. A majority in Congress may fool itself, but it can not fool the people who created that majority. And if the predicted disasters follow the enactment of this law it will be speedily replaced by one in harmony with the theory of protection.

The history of the tariff is full of coincidences, and for that reason I took the short time to put in a résumé of the facts. The election of President Polk, free-trader, over Henry Clay, protectionist, thus making possible the Walker Free Trade Act of 1846, was brought about through the defection from the Whig Party of the Abolitionists, who corresponded in a measure to the Progressives of to-day, whose third-party movement defeated the Republican candidate in the recent election. Regardless of the Abolitionist defection, Clay probably would have been elected if Mr. Polk, during his candidacy for the Presidency, had not assured the voters of Pennsylvania that he would not injure American industries. In a letter to Judge Kane, of Pennsylvania, which was widely circulated in that State, Mr. Polk said:

In my judgment it is the duty of the Government to extend as far as it may be practicable to do so, by its revenue laws and all other means within its power, fair and just protection to all the great interests of the whole Union, embracing agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation.

This promise to the voters of Pennsylvania saved that State to Polk.

Again, in 1892, Mr. Cleveland at various times during his candidacy sought to allay the fears and apprehensions of the

people in regard to the tariff. In a speech in Madison Square Garden, July 20, 1892, he said:

We are not recklessly heedless of any American interests, nor will we abandon our regard for them.

In his letter of acceptance, September 26, 1892, he wrote:

Tariff reform is still our purpose. We wage no exterminating war against any American interests. We believe a readjustment can be accomplished in accordance with the principles we profess without disaster or demolition. We contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens rather than the precipitation of free trade. We will rely upon the intelligence of our fellow countrymen to reject the charge that a party comprising the majority of our people is planning the destruction or injury of American interests.

And in 1912 we have Mr. Wilson asserting at Pittsburgh that—

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a consideration of the tariff schedules such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country.

How alike the ante-election promises of Polk, Cleveland, and Wilson!

And thus doth history repeat itself.

Despite his promises to Pennsylvania, President Polk was sponsor for the most extreme free-trade tariff act in our history.

Despite his promise to the American people that a readjustment of the tariff would be made without disaster or demolition, Mr. Cleveland favored the Wilson bill as it passed the House, with a greatly extended free list, including free wool, free coal, free hides, free lumber, and so forth.

And despite his promise of less than a year ago that the Democratic Party proposes merely a consideration of the tariff schedules such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country, President Wilson is now forcing his party to place certain products on the free list, with the inevitable result, in the minds of many of his own party, Members of Congress and others, that the industries producing those products will be seriously crippled, if not entirely destroyed.

And thus again will history repeat itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 71, page 18, lines 7 and 8, the Senator from Utah proposes to strike out, after the word "ounce," the semicolon and the words "vanilla beans, 80 cents per pound; tonka beans, 25 cents per pound."

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator from Utah, just before we adjourned on Saturday, to withdraw that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD shows that the amendment was pending. That is all the present occupant of the chair knows about it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Utah is not in the Chamber, and I will ask that the amendment be passed over during his absence. He undoubtedly stated that he would withdraw the amendment, though the clerks may not have gotten his statement; but I would not like to have action taken upon it on my statement about it in the absence of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. STONE. That the Senator from Utah may be present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the last lines of the RECORD of the proceedings of Saturday.

The Secretary proceeded to read from page 2805 of the RECORD, and read as follows:

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that this item be passed over until Monday. I should like to go into it. I do not care to delay the Senate, but I would prefer to have it passed over until Monday.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. According to the arrangement under which we are proceeding that reservation was made in favor of any Senator who desired a paragraph to be laid aside for further consideration.

Mr. JONES. I understand that the absence of a quorum was suggested by the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear him.

Mr. JONES. I know that he made the demand, because I had risen to make it when he raised the point.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Missouri did suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Chamberlain	Gallinger	Kenyon
Bankhead	Chilton	Gronna	Kern
Brady	Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	La Follette
Brandegree	Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Lane
Bristow	Crawford	James	Lea
Bryan	Cummins	Johnson, Me.	Lewis
Burton	Dillingham	Johnston, Ala.	Lodge
Cañon	Fletcher	Jones	Martin, Va.

Martine, N. J.

Norris

O'Gorman

Oliver

Overman

Page

Perkins

Pomerene

Ransdell

Reed

Robinson

Saulsbury

Shafroth

Sheppard

Sherman

Shively

Simmons

Smith, Ariz.

Smith, Ga.

Smith, Md.

Smith, Mich.

Smith, S. C.

Smoot

Stone

Sutherland

Swanson

Thomas

Thompson

Thornton

Tillman

Townsend

Vardaman

Walsh

Warren

Williams

Works

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He has a permanent pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent from the city, due to serious illness in his family, at Detroit Lake, Minn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a plain letter from a plain man which, however, I think is a sufficient answer to the very elaborate argument of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] the other day upon the subject of American wages, especially in the mining business. I have not had time to verify all the figures in it, but I think it will be found to be correct. I ask to have it read as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks consent to have read the letter he has sent to the desk. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PROVIDENCE, July 26, 1913.

MY DEAR SIR: Having read your debate in the Senate Chamber with Mr. SMOOT, of Utah, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 18, 1913, in which the Utah Senator claims the tariff laws of his party are responsible for the high rate of wages in our country, and in order to prove his claims in that respect he cites the lead-mining industry as a shining example of what protection will do for the individual engaged in that line of industry. Now, Mr. WILLIAMS, I am not going to indulge in glittering generalities, hot-air logic, or blow-hard argument. I am just going to prepare for your consideration some figures and a few facts which I have learned after studying the returns of the last national census reports in connection with mines and mining. In speaking of the industry throughout the country they say we have employed during the period above mentioned 1,086,782 wage earners, and they receive \$599,705,989 as compensation for their services, which gives each wage earner \$551.82 per year, \$10.61 per week, or \$1.77 per day. This national average includes every branch of the industry throughout the length and breadth of our land, and the gross valuation. The total cost was \$1,238,410,322, which allows each individual worker \$1,140 as his share of total amount. Now, Mr. Senator, let us go into his State of Utah and find out how much they are paid there. The same source of information which I quote from says there is employed in the mining business 11,004 wage earners and they are paid \$8,986,851, averaging \$816.69 per year, \$15.70 per week, or \$2.61 per day, and as the result of their united efforts they produce \$22,083,282 of mining commodity which gives each man or boy \$2,007 as the result of his toil. In the State of Utah the principal productions consist of copper, silver, and gold ores—this accounts for their high rate of wages within the State. We will now take up the particular industry Mr. SMOOT speaks of—the lead-mining industry. The reports says there are 21,603 wage earners distributed among a half dozen of States; chief of or principal one is the State of Missouri, which employs and produces about 75 per cent of men and material connected with the business. Now, those 21,603 men and boys receive \$10,477,657 as the reward of their yearly toil, which gives each one of them the princely sum of \$485 per year, \$9.33 per week, or \$1.55 per day. This pay, Mr. Senator, is in the lead business, which Mr. SMOOT says pays all the way from \$3.50 per day up to \$4.75 per day. Why, sir, the actual average pay is only one-third—33½ per cent—of what he claims it is—\$3.50 the lowest pay he mentioned. Now, Mr. Senator, we have working right here in the city of Providence in nonprotective industries such people as Senegambian niggers from the Cape de Verde Islands, dark-skinned Arabs from the northern shores of the Mediterranean, who receive \$2.25 per day for nine hours' work, and this pay received by those unskilled alien workmen employed in nonprotected industries is more than the wages received by the wage earners employed in the highly protected industries of the State of Rhode Island. And those industries that I refer to are woolen and worsted, cotton and jewelry, foundry and machine-shop products. In the woolen and worsted trade there are 24,924 wage earners who get \$11,537,699; the average per operative amounts to \$463 per year, \$8.90 per week, or \$1.48 per day. The cotton business employs 28,786 workers, and they receive \$11,796,733 per year, which gives each one employed in that business \$410 a head, or \$7.88 per week, or \$1.31 per day. The jewelry business—one of the most highly protected pets in the tariff laws—employs 9,511, whose total income is \$4,760,780, average \$500 each per year, \$9.61 per week, or \$1.60 per day, while the highly skilled workmen that are engaged in the foundry and machine-shop business number 10,937 and receive \$6,899,657 for the year's work, which averages \$631 each, \$12.13 per week, or \$2.02 per day. Now, any fair-minded person can by carefully comparing the wages received by those wage earners that are employed in the protected industries that I have described with the wages received by those uneducated, ignorant, unintelligent aliens that are employed in such industries as the building trades, sewer construction, macadamizing and road building, freight handling, longshoremen, coal, including trimming and shoveling, wheeling and delivering—now, Mr. Senator, any person can see that the tariff doctrine which Mr. SMOOT so piously reveres, preaches, and fervently prays for does not raise wages in Rhode Island any more than it does in Utah or Mississippi. Now, Mr. Senator, let us take the tariff rates or taxes that is levied for the benefit of the wage earners employed in the lead business. According to the rate in the Payne-Aldrich bill, 1½ cents a pound on lead ores, that amounts to \$30 a ton, while the rate on zinc ores is 1 cent a pound, which makes \$20 on zinc ores. Now, 21,603 wage earners get \$10,477,657, or \$485 each; they produce 1,335,637 tons of lead and zinc, which cost

\$31,363,094 to produce. Now, the labor cost is \$7.84 per ton. If you imported this much lead and zinc from any foreign country—the combined product, 1,335,637 tons, 2,671,274,636 pounds—you would have to pay at the customhouse on the lead \$14,021,153.85, while the zinc product would cost \$17,365,243.79; here we have a total tax of \$31,386,397.64. This protection is \$23,903 more than the cost of production. Now, Mr. Senator, who gets this overprotection of \$20,908,740.64, the miner or the mine owner? I solemnly say it is the mine owner and not the humble mine worker. Now, Mr. Senator, in looking over the statistical abstract of the United States for the year 1912 I find that the price of lead in the New York City market is \$86 per ton, and on the same page in the same volume I find the market price of zinc in St. Louis, Mo., is \$108 per ton for the year of 1909, and the following year—1910—lead rose to \$88 while zinc remained the same—\$108 per ton. Now, sir, if those two prices I find in the abstract are honest facts, where does the labor cost \$7.84 come in? The freight rate along with marine insurance is ample and sufficient protection for the scanty mite he is paid for his labor in that industry. Why it is a mere bagatelle, a beggarly pittance, compared with the wholesale selling price in New York City. There is not a commission man in the United States that would contract to supervise the importation and distribute the same amount of lead and zinc that was produced in this country for 1909 for the original cost—\$31,363,094—for the simple reason that the cost of receiving, delivering, and distributing is in our country nearly if not as large as the original cost of production. Now, Mr. Senator, if I were a Member of the United States Senate I honestly and candidly say to you I would use all the influence within my ability to place lead and zinc on the free list. Hoping my humble contribution to this great national discussion—tariff reform—may throw a little light on the subject, I remain,

Yours, most respectfully,

THOMAS F. CAWLEY,
69 Hope Street, Providence, R. I.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course I have not the honor of knowing that plain, truthful gentleman who has just written to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I do not believe that the Senator from Mississippi has closely examined the letter, or he would not have had it read.

In the first place, I want to state that no man who employs miners in the lead mines, not only in Utah, but in other States in the West, will say that they are employed for \$1.71 a day or for \$1.16½ a day, as is stated by this writer in his second statement. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is a Member of this body; he knows what the miners' wage is in Colorado; and I do not think it is very much different from what it is in Utah. The wages, Mr. President, of miners in the State of Utah are regulated by the miners' union. I myself have been somewhat interested in mining in my own State. I have seen the pay rolls; I know what miners are paid; and I know that what I stated here to the Senate was absolutely true. Now, a man in Rhode Island picks up what he claims to be statistics and tries to controvert the statement that was made by me, when he does not know what he is talking about, and I will prove it to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, he does not seem to have caught the drift of the letter. The writer is not telling what some individual miner is paid upon some particular day or during some particular month, but he has gone to the United States census reports to find the number of wage earners and the amount of wages paid, and he has divided one by the other and he has exploded—the Senator from Utah is right that I have not had any time to verify the quotations from the census report; but if the writer of the letter has quoted the census figures correctly, and I presume that he has—he has exploded that fallacy and he has proven that under the guise of a high per diem, when you come to consider the constancy of employment and the gross amount paid for the gross number of laborers, your figures do not hold out.

Mr. SMOOT. The trouble with the whole thing is that the number of employees in the mines, as well as in the cotton and the woolen mills of the country, as given by the Census Bureau, include all the employees that have been employed during the year. They may have worked 3 months, they may have worked 6 months, they may have worked 9 months, or they may have worked 12 months, but the number given includes them all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. If a man had worked 3 months and then quit and another man had been employed to take his place and he worked 3 months and then quit, and another one had been employed who worked 3 months more and then quit, and at the end of the 9 months another one was employed to work the remainder of the 3 months of the year, that would show that there were four men employed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; but the Senator from Utah also understands that, no matter how many employees there were, if the aggregate amount paid to labor during the year was so much and the aggregate number of laborers were

so many, the amount paid to each laborer per day would be so much. It does not make any difference. The way the Senator from Utah arrives at his figures is to take some fictitious person who was employed the entire year, and then he multiplies that per diem by 365 days and arrives at his conclusion in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Mississippi does me a wrong and he does his own intelligence a wrong when he makes that statement. I say to the Senator now that there is no miner in the State of Utah or in the State of Idaho or in any of the Western States who is employed for the production of gold or silver or lead who works for \$1.71 per day. The miners' union regulates that. Their wages range from \$3.50 up to \$4.75 per day, according to the work that is done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is while they are working.

Mr. SMOOT. That is per day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, the Senator brings in figures here, or presents them here to be read, to try to make it appear that the amount that is paid to the miners in the State of Utah is \$1.71 a day.

Another thing he refers to, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I presume the figures are correctly quoted from the census report. Does the Senator dispute the census figures?

Mr. SMOOT. The gentleman misconstrues what the census figures mean. I will say to the Senator that if the wage for miners was \$800 a year—I am speaking now in round figures, so as to make it plain—and one man was employed three months and he had \$200 paid to him, and another man was employed for the three months following him and he was paid \$200, and another man was employed for the three months following and he was paid \$200, and another man was employed for the next three months and he was paid \$200, that would show, by the census figures, that there were four men employed, receiving \$800; and the way that this man has figured it out here, four men being employed for one year with a wage paid of \$800, therefore the wage of the miner in the State of Utah is \$200 per annum. That is the way that the writer of that letter has figured it out.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, is not the Senator from Utah mistaken? Do not the census figures show, as to the wage earners, their average number?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the average number.

Mr. HUGHES. No; the average number means the average number that are employed, not for one day, but during the year.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the way the report is made. The average number is the number employed during the whole year.

Mr. HUGHES. Of course, that gives you the average number. Therefore it could not happen, as the Senator has said, that the man would be carried in the final list, although he was employed for only two months. He would only show in the average.

Mr. SMOOT. The way the report is made—and I know it is made from the mines in the West—is, we take the number of employees during the year that have been reported, and report that. We also report the amount of production in tons, but not in dollars and cents received.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator must be mistaken about that. I am in a position to say that the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, let the Senator's word go for that. It has been discussed here many times, and it has not been disputed here before.

Mr. HUGHES. I have made some personal investigation of this matter, not only in private establishments but in the census reports, and I never heard that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. I have made the investigation a good many times, and I know that there is no miner in the State of Utah who receives \$1.71 a day for mining.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not say that.

Mr. SMOOT. But that is what this writer says.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not speaking about his figures.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know anything about them. I am simply calling the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a column here in the Statistical Abstract, which shows that these figures relate to the average number of men employed, not the actual number.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. The Senator tells us that one miner works for two months and gets \$200 and then quits; that another miner goes to work for two months and gets \$200, and then he would quit; that another would do the same thing; and

then that another would do the same thing. Why do all those miners quit after working for two months in such profitable employment?

Mr. SMOOT. They go from one mine to another; they go from one district to another; they may have friends in another district, and they move from one to another. I ask the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] if that is not so? If the Senator from New Jersey knows so much about this, I will ask him what do the miners in the State of Utah receive?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not have any idea. I did not venture an opinion as to what they receive, and I am not talking about that. The Senator may be absolutely right. I am simply calling his attention to the way the Statistical Abstract figures are prepared.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator from Colorado if there is any miner in the State of Colorado employed in mining copper or silver or who receives only \$1.75 a day?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President. I think the contention of the Senator from Utah with reference to the wage scale is correct. He has also given the reason for it, that the miners' union fixes the rates below which no man can be employed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the writer of the letter which has been read also states that lead-bearing ores of all kinds carry a duty of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, or \$30 a ton. What do they carry? The present law provides:

Lead-bearing ores of all kinds, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

Is that \$30 a ton on the lead ore? Any man who knows anything about mining knows that the statement in the letter is not true. Ten per cent lead ore is good ore, and many a mine is worked in this country that does not contain 10 per cent of lead ore. So instead of \$30, according to the statement which was read here to illuminate the minds of Senators of the United States, the duty would amount to about \$3 per ton, instead of \$30.

The writer of the letter then gives figures as to the importations of lead ores into this country, multiplies the amount by 30, and says that is the amount of money that the American people have been assessed because of this $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound rate on lead ore.

He uses the same argument exactly with relation to zinc. Of course, I am not going to take up the zinc schedule and show in detail the inaccuracy of his figures; but he says the rate is 1 cent a pound. Upon what kind of zinc ore? Ore to-day carrying less than 10 per cent is free, and the duty is graduated up until it reaches 1 cent a pound, not upon zinc ore, but upon the zinc contained in the ore. I simply wanted to say this much to the Senator from Mississippi in answer to this letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I were to employ a man at \$15 a month and kept him employed 10 months, and had no use for him the other two months, I would pay him \$150, and when I came to divide the \$150 by 365 days I would have paid the man 41 cents a day; but if I resorted to the popular Republican method, I would multiply the \$15 per month by 12 instead of 10. I would then get 50 cents a day, and I would contend that the man was paid 50 cents a day. If I had used him only two months during the entire time, when I needed him very badly, and paid him \$20 a month and multiplied it by 12, I would increase what he had actually received from about 10.9 cents per day, when it was averaged throughout the year, to about six or seven times as much.

From the very manner in which the letter was written the author is evidently a very plain man, a workman. I never heard of him; I know nothing about him, and have not verified his figures; but it struck me his statements came with such a ring of sincerity, that there was about them so much of the characteristic workman's disposition to look into things for himself, that I wanted his letter honored by a place in the Record. If I have served no other purpose I have served the purpose of securing a very valuable admission from the Senator from Utah. Just a moment ago he triumphantly announced that the miners' union in Utah fixed the price of wages. Hitherto he has been contending that it was the tariff. We have got at least that much out of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, Mr. President, I think the Senator is absolutely mistaken in not applying also the reasons that have been given heretofore, that the tariff has a great deal to do with wages. I have never said that it had not. Men are not compelled to work in the mines; they can work at anything else they desire, not only in Mississippi, but in every other State in the Union. I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi, now, if he does not believe that that letter is inaccurate and misleading?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In so far as the man's method in getting at what the true wages are, it is not inaccurate, but, on the contrary, the statements of the Senator from Utah are inaccurate. So far as the man's calculation of the rate upon lead is concerned, it is self-evidently inaccurate, because he multiplied the rate per pound by the entire weight of the lead ore.

It is God's everlasting gospel truth, and you can not get away from it, that the amount of money paid out for wages in a year divided by the number of men who have worked throughout the year for those wages for the average time worked during the year is the absolutely true wage payment of American labor. When you say that your lead miners are paid \$3.65 a day and then neglect to notice the fact that half or two-thirds of them are not employed all the year, and when you arrive at an annual payment for wages and divide that by 365 days you are not arriving at a correct result. The census does proceed upon the right principle. The census takes the average number of men employed, and it takes the entire amount paid for wages.

Now, in another respect the letter which has been read is not inaccurate. The writer of the letter goes on and gives the value of these products, and the laborer's share of the total gross value is very small, indeed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from personal experience, that if you take prospecting, developing, and mining all together, I believe that 90 per cent of the total amount goes for the transportation of the ores and to the laboring men. This is something that theory will not dovetail with. We know the absolute facts and conditions—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The census reports are not theory.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, the Senator, from what he has just stated, tries to impress upon the Senate that the figures of the man who wrote the letter which has been read are correct, and that \$1.71 per day is the wage paid to the miner in the State of Utah or in the State of Colorado, whereas the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] himself, one who is interested in the preparation of this bill, says that those figures are not true, whether they are census figures or the figures of the gentleman from Providence, R. I.

Mr. THOMAS. They are not correct in so far, Mr. President, as they apply to conditions in the Senator's State and in mine.

Mr. SMOOT. This learned gentleman refers to my own State.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am not so much interested in the way Senators have figured these matters out, as I am in the way this alleged information was presented to the Senate. I do not believe the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will think, after he has considered the matter carefully, that he has done just exactly the proper thing. He admits he knows nothing about this man and that he has not verified the figures; yet the gentleman who wrote the letter—an anonymous letter, so far as we know anything of the writer—has used language in reference to a Senator that is not, to say the least, very complimentary. What I am objecting to, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the uncomplimentary language?

Mr. TOWNSEND. He was stating in a most sarcastic manner matters in reference to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. WILLIAMS. He said the Senator from Utah zealously preached and fervently prayed for the doctrine of protection. That is true. There is nothing sarcastic or rude about that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We all heard the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I zealously preach the opposite doctrine and fervently pray for its consummation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We all heard it, and we all understood just exactly why the writer said it. What I am objecting to is the continuance of this practice which has been indulged by men throughout the country of writing letters, making reckless and unauthenticated statements which are not founded upon facts, or may not be, and then giving them prominence by placing them in the Record as an argument in favor of some question under discussion here by men who do not vouch for the writers at all and who do not even know them.

I do not object to anything being placed in the Record that is going to shed any light upon the discussion prepared by men who are known to be honorable, competent, and capable, but I do seriously object to this kind of irresponsible arguments being placed in the Record of the United States Senate. I do not think it is fair; I do not think it is just to the Senate or to the country. We all get many letters. I have the same right to bring in here and have printed letters I have received saying mean things about some Senators which I knew would not bear investigation, but certainly I would not present them, because they could serve no purpose, unless it might be to prejudice somebody. It is to that I object.

I asked the Senator when he rose what he was going to introduce, but I did not hear him. I do not say that I would have objected to its introduction, because I would have had confidence in the good judgment of the Senator from Mississippi. But it does not seem to me that it has any place in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have been duly impressed with the sacrosanct manner of the Senator from Michigan, and I feel rebuked to an extent that I can hardly express, especially as it comes from the other side of the Chamber, where they have never hesitated to put into the RECORD every time they could letters from men whose pocketbook nerve was touched by tariff legislation.

There is nothing in this letter that is rude, either to the Senate or to the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Michigan can not make it so appear, simply because it is not a fact.

In connection with the letter, it is evidently, from the very face of it, the letter of a plain American who has been giving himself the trouble to study the tariff to the best of his ability. That he has made some mistakes may be true, but I am not prepared to believe, just because he is, as the Senator from Michigan seems to think, upon the other side of the issue, that he is purposely misquoting the census figures. That he may have made some mistakes I doubt not. I said at the beginning that I had not verified his quotations; but in so far as that is concerned, he has just as much right to be heard through me, as one of the ambassadors of one of the States upon this floor, as has the Senator from Michigan himself, provided only that his language is decent and respectful to the Senate and to Senators; and it was decent and respectful to both.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that we now proceed with the reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. Mr. GRONNA obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Referring to this amendment, in connection with the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi to the Senator from Utah that this debate has developed the fact that it is the labor unions, and not the tariff, that fix wages in the mining regions of the country—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said the Senator from Utah had made that admission.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Utah will not agree to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I qualified it, Mr. President, and said—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I leave it to the record. What the Senator said is in the record. It will not be changed, I am sure.

Mr. SMOOT. What I said, Mr. President, was that anyone would know that the miners were not receiving the amount stated by the gentleman who wrote this letter, for the union rates of wages were such that the figures could not possibly be true.

Mr. GALLINGER. The only observation I wish to make is that if we did not have tariff duties on these products, and the products came from foreign countries instead of being developed from our own mines, the labor unions would not have any wages to fix.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of briefly discussing paragraph 71; but before I do that I want to say, in all kindness, to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that he has not familiarized himself with all kinds of labor when he says that the way to determine the amount of wages per day is to figure the number of laborers and the number of days of labor. I wish to say to the Senator that in my State, which is an agricultural State, we find it difficult to keep men for any great length of time even at very high wages. We find that to be especially true during the time we are harvesting the grain, and more particularly during the time we are thrashing the grain, when we are paying all the way from \$2.50 to \$3.50 per day.

I make this observation for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi, because he is mistaken in the statement he made a few moments ago. We pay these men \$3.50 a day and board. I have myself paid that rate to hundreds of them. After they work 10 days they want to go to town or want to do something else. North Dakota is a prohibition State. There are no saloons in those towns, and they have to go across the line into Minnesota; or, if they are closer to Montana, they go into Montana. They will go and stay away two or three days. They will come back, not to work for me, but perhaps for my neighbor. After they have worked 10 days they have earned

\$35; and if the Senator from Mississippi knew conditions in the West as I know them he would know that when laboring men of that class get \$35 it almost burns a hole in their pockets and they are ready to spend it for some purpose. It takes all the way from 25 to 30 men to constitute a thrashing crew. Let us say that we thrash 10 days. That would be, at the maximum, 300 men. We may have employed 500 men during that time, not because we do not want to employ the same men right along, but because they do not want to stay on the job.

I have a great deal of respect for every word uttered by the Senator from Mississippi; but there are certain small things, at least, with which the Senator from Mississippi has failed to familiarize himself, and this is one of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My friend was never worse mistaken in his life. The Senator from Mississippi is perfectly familiar with the very condition which the Senator from North Dakota is describing. Perhaps the greatest floating labor in the world is the negro labor of the South. If you are hiring a wage squad of 12 men you will probably have to change the personnel of your wage squad every month, pretty nearly, or certainly a part of it, but that has not anything to do with what I was asserting. The Senator seems to have misunderstood what I said.

Mr. GRONNA. No; I did not misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My assertion was simply that if you want to arrive at the labor cost of any product in the world, the only possible way in which you can arrive at it is to take the total volume of the product and the total amount of wages paid out and the total price and value of the product, and in that way find out—

Mr. GRONNA. How about the number of men?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will come to that in a minute—and in that way find out what proportion of the total cost the labor cost constitutes. In arriving at the total labor cost the Census Bureau arrives at the average number of men working, and if these figures are correctly quoted from the report of the Census Bureau, they are based upon the average number of laborers working during the year. In other words, if one man works three months and another man works four months and another man works five months, those three men constitute one man. That is my understanding of the principle upon which the census is taken.

Mr. GRONNA. I was not basing my argument upon the census figures. I was basing my argument upon the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi. Certainly, he is mistaken when he says that the amount of wages per day is based upon the number of men and the total amount of wages.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the Senator must pardon me—

Mr. GRONNA. I may have employed 3,000 men, and yet I may not have had, at one and the same time, more than 300 men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, of course; everybody understands that. I was referring to the number of men reported by the census as being employed. If I understand the method upon which the Census Bureau proceeds, it is not the method the Senator is attributing to me, and my remarks were made with reference to the quotations from the census. The census gives the total amount paid out for labor and the total number of laborers arrived at by their calculations. That does not mean that a man that works three hours is counted as having worked any longer than that.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; but when I am asked by the census enumerator how many men I employ, I state that on an average I employ so many men; and when I am asked: "How many men did you employ last year?" it may be ten times or it may be twenty times as many men as I employ every day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no difference between us on that point—not a particle.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well; then I am ready to proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they came to me and asked me how many men I employed, if I had a wage squad of 10 men, I would say "Ten men," although perhaps the personnel of the 10 men would change somewhat every month.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well, Mr. President; I understand, then, that the Senator from Mississippi agrees with me.

I stated on Saturday that I should like to make some observations on this paragraph, No. 71, but not for the purpose of criticizing the action of the committee, because I believe the committee has acted wisely in reducing the duty on vanilla

extract. I believe the duty was too high and is too high in the present bill. But I wish to ask the Senator in charge of this schedule of the bill why there should be a duty on the natural product—that is, the vanilla bean? As I understand, the vanilla bean is a product of South America, and possibly there is some raised in Mexico. We import all of this product. None of it is produced in the United States.

Vanilla may be classed as a luxury, but we know that it is used by every housewife and that in every home you will find vanilla used for various purposes. It is not regarded to-day as a luxury any more than spice is a luxury. So I desire to suggest to the committee that vanilla beans be placed on the free list.

I do not share the belief of the Senator from Utah that tonka beans should be placed on the free list. I, for one, wish no tonka beans were permitted to be imported.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from North Dakota if he can imagine any article that is more universally used than vanilla?

Mr. GRONNA. No, Mr. President; I will say to the Senator that I can not.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in practically every home—of the rich and of the poor.

Mr. GRONNA. It is in every home, so far as I know.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been on the free list heretofore, as I understand.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; it has been on the free list, and it is on the free list in the present law.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is now proposed to make it dutiable?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator does not think that ought to be done, I apprehend, and some of the rest of us do not think it ought to be done.

Mr. GRONNA. No, Mr. President; I had hoped, and I hope now, that the Senate will again place it on the free list. I say this in no spirit of criticism at all, since I approve the action of the Senate committee in reducing the duty on vanilla extract.

I believe there should be a duty on the tonka bean. I do not agree with the statement made by the Senator from Utah. The tonka bean, as I understand, is used for various purposes; but the oil is also extracted from the tonka bean and sold for vanilla. I have been told by men who are engaged in the extract business that it is a mild poison. For that reason I desire to suggest to the committee that a duty, perhaps a heavier duty, should be placed on the tonka bean, but certainly the vanilla bean should be on the free list.

I do not care to delay the Senate further. I simply desired to make these few observations.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the trade in vanilla beans has become quite an important one with the business men of San Francisco. There has grown up a system of exchange or barter of the vanilla bean raised in the island of Tahiti for the goods of this country shipped to that island. In other words, the vanilla bean is taken as money in exchange for goods from this country sent to the island.

The vanilla bean has been on the free list, and this trade has been built up under that system. If a duty of 30 cents a pound is now imposed upon vanilla beans, the result will be that the merchants of San Francisco, in the first instance, will be compelled to pay that 30 cents a pound in addition to what they have been paying, and of course that will be carried along to the consumer. In other words, it is simply imposing a direct tax upon the people of this country for a necessary that is used in almost every household in the United States. I am unable to see upon what theory any such tax as that can be imposed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I move as an amendment, to strike out, after the semicolon, in line 7, page 18, the words "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, the duty imposed upon vanilla beans in this paragraph is imposed purely as a revenue duty. The statistics show that we imported in the year 1912, \$2,025,153 worth of vanilla beans. The duty laid is a very small one, 30 cents per pound, equivalent to an ad valorem duty of about 15 per cent, and simply for purposes of revenue.

It is true that there are some vanilla beans, called the Tahiti beans, imported from Tahiti into San Francisco. Some of them, but not all, are exported. From the brief of the firm engaged in the business it appears that about two-thirds of what were imported by them were exported. The committee heard the representative of the firm, and felt that if the firm wanted to reexport and chose to do so a drawback could be obtained under the tariff act if the goods were exported after being imported

into this country. But it is purely as a revenue measure that the duty is imposed.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean that they are exported in the same form in which they are imported?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. No; they are sorted, and some work is done upon them; so there is something done in the way of manufacturing them—advancing them in value.

Mr. LODGE. Of course under the existing law there would be a drawback. I do not know how the administrative features of this bill are in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I have been informed that there would be a drawback provision because of the work expended upon them in the way of sorting.

Mr. LODGE. I mean I should think that would appear in the figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. They have not taken advantage of it; but there has been no reason for doing so, because vanilla beans have been upon the free list heretofore.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. While I am on my feet I will say a few words in regard to tonka beans. They are used in making coumarin, a preparation which is largely used as a flavoring extract in the manufacture of tobacco. The duty here imposed is a small one of 25 cents per pound, equivalent to 14.2 per cent ad valorem, which we felt was in accordance with other duties laid in this schedule.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in 1912 there were imported from Tahiti 325,264 pounds of vanilla beans. Of that amount there were exported, for the same year, 239,158 pounds. There were imported from other countries than Tahiti 516,364 pounds, or there remained in the United States, to be consumed in the United States, 602,470 pounds.

The estimate that is given in the Democratic handbook states that there will be a million pounds of vanilla beans imported, which, at the rate of 30 cents a pound, amounts to \$300,000. If we export from now on the same proportion that we have in the past, that will be 400,000 pounds, leaving 600,000 pounds to be used in the United States. At 30 cents a pound that is only \$180,000, instead of \$300,000, as estimated in the handbook.

The importers of vanilla beans say it is almost impossible for them to handle the bean after it reaches this country in connection with other beans that are imported here and export the same bean. It is almost an impossibility, and unless it were the same bean it would be impossible for them to get the drawback on the amount exported.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Utah to what countries these beans are exported after they have been imported into the United States? It seems to me rather a singular trade situation that a product of that kind should be imported into the United States and then exported from the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. After these beans are prepared by the importers of the country some of them go to Ireland, some to England, and other European countries. The trade with San Francisco has brought from Tahiti the vanilla beans to the merchants of San Francisco, and the business of preparing them for the market has been carried on there to a great extent.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I rose to ask the Senator from Utah if he is not mistaken in his figures. A million pounds at \$2 a pound would be \$2,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I had reference to the duty.

Mr. GRONNA. At 15 per cent ad valorem it would amount to \$300,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I said that the estimate of 30 cents a pound duty on a million pounds amounted to \$300,000.

Mr. GRONNA. My objection to the duty on the vanilla bean is that it taxes the breakfast table of the American people to the extent of \$300,000 a year, according to the committee's own estimate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the motion which I made on Saturday was to strike out "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound; tonka beans, 25 cents per pound." I understand, however, that the Senator from North Dakota has offered an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that it would be better to vote on it as a divided question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated from the desk.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota to be stated from the desk?

Mr. STONE. Yes; let it be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from North Dakota proposes, on page 18, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

Mr. STONE. The Senator from North Dakota means to transfer vanilla beans to the free list?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; transfer them to the free list.

Mr. STONE. Vanilla beans have been on the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he is prepared to say whether the figures I now give are correct, or approximately correct—that the imports for the last year were 1,140,000 pounds?

Mr. SMOOT. For the year 1912?

Mr. STONE. Nineteen hundred and eleven.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; for the year 1911 they were 1,140,630 pounds.

Mr. STONE. That is about the same as I stated.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. STONE. The figures were given to me as 1,140,000, without the odd figures.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. STONE. The great bulk of these beans came from the Tahiti Islands, the French Oceanic possessions.

Mr. SMOOT. About 60 per cent. I will give the Senator the exact figures. From Tahiti there came 617,076 pounds, and from all other countries 523,554 pounds.

Mr. STONE. Yes; but a good part of that which came from other countries was from France, and those were beans that were taken from the Tahiti Islands to France and from France imported into the United States. They do not produce the beans in France. They come from a French possession, French Oceania.

Mr. SMOOT. The Tahiti bean is imported directly from Tahiti to San Francisco; but the Indian beans that the French handle, of which the Senator speaks, perhaps, go directly to France. The Tahiti beans do not go to France and then come into the United States.

Mr. STONE. I think they do.

Mr. SMOOT. I am informed that they do not, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. I think they are taken from this French possession to France, and that quite a large amount in pounds is afterwards sent from France to the United States.

The great bulk of these beans coming into the United States—the Senator says 60 per cent, and I think he is approximately correct about that—come from the Tahiti Islands to San Francisco. There is a firm in San Francisco that has built up a very considerable business in the importation of these beans, a good part of which are distributed in the United States, but I think the greater part of which they carry on through the United States to foreign countries.

Mr. SMOOT. About two-thirds.

Mr. STONE. About two-thirds. For what purpose does the Senator understand that these vanilla beans are used?

Mr. SMOOT. They are used for the manufacture of extract of vanilla and some classes of people use them in closets as a scent.

Mr. STONE. Perfumery?

Mr. SMOOT. No, vanilla.

Mr. STONE. They are used to manufacture vanilla extract.

Mr. SMOOT. The great bulk, I think.

Mr. STONE. The greater part of them, practically all of them, which in turn is used as a flavor in the manufacture of ice cream and things of that kind.

Mr. SMOOT. In puddings and everything almost that is cooked in the home.

Mr. STONE. It is a flavor, and a part of it is used to make perfumes, and, as the Senator says, in closets, bureau drawers, and trunks, and things of that kind. It strikes me that that is a luxury; and I submit that it is a subject of legitimate taxation in a bill framed upon the theory of raising revenue by imposing duties on luxuries especially, higher duties on luxuries and lower duties on necessities.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STONE. I am through.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wanted to ask for information from the Senator from Missouri, in charge of this schedule—

Mr. STONE. I am not in charge of the schedule.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh! I wanted to ascertain where the million pounds came from that has been discussed.

Mr. STONE. Where it comes from?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes; where are the figures found?

Mr. STONE. The figures that I have before me—I do not vouch for their entire accuracy except as they are taken—

Mr. SIMMONS. The figures are taken, if the Senator will permit me, from the imports of merchandise for the year ending June 30, 1911.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was asking the question because the Tariff Handbook that is furnished us, on page 86, gives the importation for 1910 as seven hundred and ninety-six thousand and odd pounds, and in 1912—

Mr. SIMMONS. That is correct for 1910; but for 1911 the figures the Senator has there—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The importation for 1911 is not here. In 1912 the last importations were 841,639 pounds. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is the last year's importation when they were on the free list. Now, the estimate of the committee is that by putting it on the dutiable list at 30 cents a pound we will increase the importation 200,000 pounds.

Mr. STONE. I do not know whether we will increase the importation 200,000 pounds or decrease it 200,000 pounds. An estimate made by Treasury officials based upon percentages in past bills is an exceedingly unreliable basis upon which to proceed. You can not tell; it may be greater or it may be less. Those estimates are made by officials. I do not know how valuable they are.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me, that the importation of this article seems to vary very much in different years. In 1907 it was 969,000 pounds; then, in 1908, it fell to 571,000. The next year, 1909, it went up to 1,121,000 pounds, and immediately fell down the next year to 797,000 pounds. In 1911 it went up to 1,140,000 pounds.

Mr. STONE. Now, Mr. President, I think we have spent time enough on vanilla beans, and I ask that we may proceed.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard briefly.

Mr. STONE. Very well.

Mr. BURTON. I trust Senators on the other side of the aisle will vote to retain vanilla beans on the free list. There are numerous objections to the imposition of this duty. In the first place, it is making an article dutiable which has not been so before. That in itself should arouse inquiry.

It is said as a justification of this act that it is for revenue. Now, if you are going to raise revenue by the imposition of duties on these classes of noncompeting articles, why not impose duties on coffee and on tea, on categories of products which amount to something instead of creating vexation and confusion in the administration of the revenue laws by picking up a score of items like this?

Mr. STONE. Does not the Senator from Ohio think there is any difference between the workingman taking his cup of coffee and the young man and the young woman who go to a café after the theater to get a dish of ice cream?

Mr. BURTON. I think the young lady and the young gentleman are quite as fond of the ice cream and the glass of soda as of a cup of tea.

Mr. STONE. And the workingman's cup of coffee?

Mr. BURTON. One is a necessary article just as much as the other.

Again, it is very undesirable to interfere with the general adjustment of trade. Manufacturing and commercial operations have adjusted themselves to a condition in which these articles have been free from duty.

There is another objection which lies in the fact that these beans are largely exported as well as imported, and it is the experience that, notwithstanding our drawback provision, this article is so materially modified after it is imported and before exportation that it is very doubtful whether the drawback could be collected.

Again, this article has increased in value very considerably in the last 12 months, perhaps as much as a dollar a pound.

I have here a couple of letters, Mr. President, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD. One of them states the case so clearly, however, that I will read it. If there is no objection to it, I should like to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BURTON. I will say that I have received letters in regard to this article not only from manufacturers of flavoring extracts but from chemists, grocers, and bakers, all making a strenuous protest. This letter is under date June 5:

NEWARK, OHIO, June 5, 1913.

Senator THEODORE BURTON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to enter our protest against the placing of any duty on oil of lemon or vanilla beans, and ask that you consider the following reasons:

1. These items can not be produced in this country.
2. They are used almost exclusively by flavoring-extract manufacturers, and the burden of any duties would be borne by the poorer classes.

of people. The wealthy can use fresh fruits to obtain the flavor of orange, lemon, etc., while the poor, and especially the rural classes, must depend upon flavoring extracts.

3. The advance in prices made necessary by existing pure-food laws has already placed burdens upon this industry equal to, if not in excess, of that borne by any other industry except the tobacco and liquor business.

4. Any further advance is like "the straw that broke the camel's back," and it will—

I want to call attention to this point—

and it will entirely eliminate the 5-cent package and make it necessary to change the 10-cent package to a 15-cent seller.

There are a number of these little duties here. The percentage may seem to be very small, but it will make to the consumer—the person who buys at the retail store—the difference between what is now a comparatively cheap parcel—say 5 cents and 10 cents, or possibly 15 cents—because the manufacturer and the retailer will take into account this duty and compel the purchaser to bear the full burden of it.

5. Flavoring extracts should rightly and justly be considered as necessities and not luxuries, and the raw flavoring materials have always been on the free list.

Now, here is another point that has not been brought out in this discussion:

6. Any further duty would likely result in manufacturers making imitation extracts in which they would use only 20 per cent alcohol. This would mean that the Government would lose much more in internal revenue than they would gain by the proposed duty. The internal revenue on a gallon of alcohol is now \$2.09, and it does look as though this ought to be enough to exact from the extract manufacturer.

7. The addition of these duties would bring protests from millions of housekeepers all over the land.

We therefore request and urge that you consider this matter and hope that you will be able to enter your protest against any further duties upon these products.

Thanking you for any consideration given our request, we are,

Very truly, yours,

THE STYRON-BEGGS CO.,
F. L. BEGGS, Secretary.

The further letter submitted by Mr. BURTON is as follows:

DAYTON, OHIO, April 14, 1913.

Hon. THEODORE BURTON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May we not ask you to use your best endeavors to have eliminated from the Underwood tariff measure the provision assessing a duty of 50 cents per pound on vanilla beans, a product not heretofore taxed?

By reason of short crops in various countries this article is selling at practically \$1 more than several years ago, and to increase the cost still further by this tax will further increase the price to the consumer. The most pernicious effect, however, will be the encouraging of the manufacture and sale of substitutes or imitations of vanilla flavor, which, while not injurious, are certainly undesirable for use as vanilla flavor. Manufacturers who have been trying to build up a business on pure goods will be very much hampered in this situation, and as it particularly affects ourselves and others in this State we hope you can consistently give the matter your attention in the direction indicated.

Yours, truly,

THE CANBY, ACH & CANBY CO.

Mr. BURTON. In view of the fact that this discussion has been rather lengthy, Mr. President, I do not wish to take up more time. It is evident that this will impose an additional burden on the consumer far in excess of any benefit derived by the revenue. It is likely to lead to the use of substitutes which will diminish the quantity of internal-revenue tax, which will diminish in an altogether greater sum than anything that can be collected in the way of duties.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. STONE. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to strike out, in line 7, "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. GALLINGER called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). I am paired for the rest of the afternoon with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] during the rest of the afternoon. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOF]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I

wish to transfer it to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I will transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who has not voted. I will transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LEA. I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. May I inquire if the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from California. As he is not present I will withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who is necessarily detained from the Chamber on important business, and therefore I withhold by vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I will let this announcement stand for the remainder of the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LEA (after having voted in the negative). I understand that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has a pair, and so I withdraw my vote. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the negative). After I transferred my pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] he has come into the Chamber and voted. I therefore want to withdraw the announcement and withdraw my vote and announce that I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Borah	Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Smoot
Bradley	Crawford	Lodge	Sterling
Brady	Cummins	Nelson	Townsend
Brandegee	Dillingham	Norris	Warren
Bristow	Gallinger	Oliver	Weeks
Burton	Gronna	Page	Works
Catron	Jones	Sherman	
Clapp	Kenyon	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—37.

Ashurst	Kern	Robinson	Stone
Bacon	Lane	Shafroth	Thomas
Bryan	Lewis	Sheppard	Thompson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shields	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Tillman
Gore	Owen	Simmons	Vardaman
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	
Johnston, Ala.	Reed	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—29.

Bankhead	Goff	Myers	Saulsbury
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Newlands	Stephenson
Chilton	Hughes	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Overman	Swanson
Colt	Lea	Penrose	Williams
Culberson	Lippitt	Perkins	
du Pont	McCumber	Poindexter	
Fall	McLean	Root	

So Mr. GRONNA's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, lines 7 and 8, strike out "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound; tonka beans, 25 cents per pound."

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was continued, as follows:

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

72. Fire brick, magnesite brick, chrome brick, and brick not specially provided for in this section, not glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, 10 per cent ad valorem; if glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, and bath brick, 15 per cent ad valorem.

73. Tiles, plain unglazed, one color, exceeding 2 square inches in size, 13 cents per square foot; glazed, ornamented, hand-painted, enameled, vitrified, semivitrified, decorated, encaustic, ceramic mosaic, flint, spar,

embossed, gold-decorated, grooved and corrugated, and all other earthenware tiles and tiling, except pill tiles and so-called quarries or quarry tiles, but including tiles wholly or in part of cement, 5 cents per square foot; so-called quarries or quarry tiles, 20 per cent ad valorem; mantels, friezes, and articles of every description or parts thereof, composed wholly or in chief value of earthenware tiles or tiling, except pill tiles, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WEEKS. I rise, Mr. President, to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he knows what percentage in the cost of tiles includes the labor cost? What part of the total cost is labor cost in making tiles?

Mr. STONE. I ask the Senator if he knows.

Mr. WEEKS. I am asking for information.

Mr. STONE. The bill, of course, is not based on the Republican theory the Senator has in mind of the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad.

Mr. WEEKS. That would not make any difference, then, in the duty which would be imposed in this case?

Mr. STONE. It would not.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator says it would not?

Mr. STONE. It would not. I should like, however, as the Senator asked the question, to repeat the question, just for information, being a little curious myself, as the Senator is, to know what the difference in the labor cost is.

Mr. WEEKS. I would not take the time of the Senate to have asked the question if I had had the information at hand, but I supposed that those who framed the bill would have it ready to impart to those who had not the information.

Mr. STONE. For what purpose did the Senator seek the information?

Mr. WEEKS. I will go on and explain the purpose for which I sought the information. I have a protest from the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance against this duty, in which they say:

We protest against the heavy reduction proposed. The American tile worker, presser, and kiln placer receive \$14.50 and \$15, respectively, while the Belgium worker receives \$3.92 and \$4.90 for the same labor; wages for the same line of work in Spain and Italy are less than those paid in Belgium. Ruination for plants as well as for the laborers if the tariff proposed is enacted.

I simply want to submit that information to demonstrate the fact that no attention whatever has been given to the result to labor in imposing this duty.

Mr. STONE. What per cent of the American production is represented in labor?

Mr. WEEKS. The figures are given in the statistics which are on the desk of every Senator.

Mr. STONE. The Senator asked the question and I thought—

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator has the information before him.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I have the information before me. I do not see the point of the Senator's contention. I ask for a vote on the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendment has been proposed. The reading will proceed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out paragraph 74, embraced in lines 4 and 5, on page 19, as follows:

74. Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement, 5 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri to let that amendment go over to-day. I wish to call his attention to the fact, as I believe, that it will take in a cement that the committee has not considered.

Mr. STONE. What cement?

Mr. SMOOT. The white Portland cement, used where it is required that no staining shall be done. The ordinary, common Portland cement stains wherever it is used upon real white work, and now they are making what is called the Roman cement, a white cement, and to-day, even under the rate they have, it is a little less than 12 per cent equivalent ad valorem. I wish the Senator would let the amendment be passed over, and I will call his attention to it and see whether he will not agree to a change.

Mr. STONE. Of course, if the Senator makes the request, under the rule that has been observed I shall not object to passing it over. Does the Senator ask to have it passed over until to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. Until we return to the amendments.

Mr. STONE. Well, during the consideration of the schedule?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I may not be prepared to present it at that time. I will suggest to the Senator to let it go over until the bill has been read, as other paragraphs have gone over, and then we will take up from the beginning those paragraphs that have been passed over in the order in which they were passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is speaking about Keene's cement?

Mr. SMOOT. No; Keene's cement is provided for in paragraph 76. It is white Portland cement. I think that the wording of it can be arranged so that it will apply only to that cement and not to common Portland cement.

Mr. STONE. I will not ask the Senator to state now what he thinks the wording should be. We will let it be passed over and later hear what he has to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

75. Lime, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES. I ask that that paragraph may go over. I will say that I will be ready to take it up either to-morrow or at any time before the conclusion of this schedule.

Mr. STONE. The lime paragraph?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, ground or calcined, pearl hardening for paper makers' use, Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, and all other building cements not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Missouri, because I know that unless I can make some impression upon him I have no hope of being able to make any upon the paragraph.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will pardon me, as my attention was diverted for a moment, I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 76, page 19, line 11, after the word "section," it is proposed to strike out "10" and to insert "20," and at the end of the paragraph to add the following proviso:

Provided, That the duties levied and collected upon the commodities covered by this paragraph shall in no event be less than the duties levied and collected by any adjoining country upon the importation of said commodities into such adjoining country from the United States.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the print of the bill which I have before me does not seem to correspond with the one which the Senator from Iowa has.

Mr. CUMMINS. The paragraph to which I offer the amendment is numbered 76, and is upon page 19 of the bill. The amendment proposed is to strike out "10" and to insert "20," which will make the duty 20 per cent instead of 10.

Mr. STONE. And then to add the countervailing provision?

Mr. CUMMINS. And the substance of the other part of the amendment is to provide that we shall not admit these commodities into the United States from Canada upon any better terms than Canada will admit our like commodities into that country.

Mr. President, there is, I think, the best reasons in the world for some change in this paragraph. I shall not enter into any extended history of the development of the enterprise. I would not be entirely candid, however, if I were not to say that it is one of the all too few manufacturing enterprises which have been carried on with some success in my State. The corporation or company which has its headquarters in Fort Dodge, Iowa, which was the home of my late colleague, Mr. Dolliver, is one of the relatively large companies engaged in the business.

Prior to the Payne-Aldrich tariff law these commodities carried a high duty, higher, indeed, in my opinion, than was necessary to exemplify the doctrine of protection. They are among the very few the duties upon which were very radically reduced in the Payne-Aldrich law. My late colleague, Mr. Dolliver, had a theory with regard to that, which I shall not state, because I think it is immaterial. It is only necessary to say that under the Dingley law these commodities, taken as a whole, carried a duty of nearly 50 per cent. I can not recall the exact rate, but Senators can easily ascertain by referring to the Tariff Handbook which accompanies the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Forty-four per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Payne-Aldrich law reduced these duties so that upon an average they were 25 per cent, a reduction of nearly 50 per cent. The pending bill reduces that average to 10 per cent. It is not fair to the industry.

I would not be so insistent upon it if it were not for the action of the only, or substantially the only, competing country with regard to the subject. I assume that all Senators know that the principal product that is manufactured from gypsum rock is what is known as hard plaster—wall plaster. We formerly had a market to some extent for this commodity in

Canada. Canada now has very extensive manufactures both east and west. Our market for hard plaster in Canada formerly was in the western portion of the Dominion. Canada, however, inspired with a desire to further the interests of her own people, has advanced the duty upon this commodity to \$2.50 per ton, whereas the 10 per cent proposed in this bill will levy a duty on importations from Canada into the United States of from 35 to 50 cents per ton, which will give the market of this country in large measure to Canada.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator from Iowa states that the duty under the Dingley law was practically 50 per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Forty-four or forty-five per cent; I have forgotten which.

Mr. JAMES. Forty-five per cent, and it was reduced in the present law 25 per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. It was reduced to 25 per cent; not reduced 25 per cent.

Mr. JAMES. Very well. Is it not true that the rate was still prohibitive and that there have been practically no more importations under the Payne-Aldrich law than there were under the Dingley law, showing that the rate under the present law is just as prohibitive as was the rate under the Dingley law?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator from Kentucky has stated substantially the truth, but he forgets that Canada has just prepared herself for taking the market of this country. These great factories in Canada are of comparatively recent origin, and it seems to me that when you propose to allow Canada to come into the United States with a duty of 35 cents a ton, and Canada is requiring us to pay \$2.50 a ton upon the same product, you are legislating not in behalf of the people of the United States, but you are legislating in behalf of the people of Canada. It will be so interpreted, and it will be so found in effect.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has just stated that the duty which now prevails is practically prohibitive. I have here a statement that 400,000 tons of this article were imported from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into New York alone last year, which would not indicate that the duty was prohibitive.

Mr. JAMES. Four hundred thousand what?

Mr. WEEKS. Four hundred thousand tons.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand the Senator from Kentucky to mean that the amount of this article imported into the United States was but a small proportion of the amount consumed here.

Mr. WEEKS. I think that may be true.

Mr. CUMMINS. And in that sense the statement of the Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. JAMES. In order to be absolutely accurate about it, so that there will be no mistake, I will state that the record shows that there were \$363,000 worth imported in 1905 under the rate of 44.21 per cent under the Dingley law, and \$437,000 worth imported under the 25 per cent rate of the present law in 1912. So the increase by reason of reducing the tariff, as the Senator says, practically 50 per cent was about \$60,000. The total production in this country is \$12,803,758 worth.

Mr. WEEKS. That was in 1909.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it must not be forgotten that this is a comparatively new industry; it is now really in a stage of development, although the hard plaster is generally accepted as a most available and most valuable commodity for use in the building of houses. Canada, however, will produce the article as cheaply as it can be produced in the United States. I am not contending that it can be produced much more cheaply in Canada than in the United States, but assuming that it can be produced with substantial uniformity in cost, it is still, as it seems to me, unpatriotic to allow Canada to come here with a duty imposed by us upon her product that amounts to nothing whatsoever; it is a mere nominal duty. You might just as well put the commodity on the free list. Of course, you do secure a little revenue, but it will have no tendency, or substantially no tendency, to prevent importations. A very little difference in freight rates will more than overcome all the duty that is here imposed, and if we are to perpetuate what I regard as a false system of allowing freight rates from Canada to the United States to be adjusted upon the basis of through rates, the outcome will be that there will be factories in Canada that can reach the interior of the United States, or at least some

parts of the interior of the United States, for a less freight rate than can our own factories; and you will have legislated our enterprises into a position of positive disadvantage as compared with their foreign competitors.

Why not treat Canada in this respect as Canada treats us? If Canada were willing to give us free trade in this commodity, it would be a serious question with me as to whether we ought not to accept the proposition; but so long as Canada excludes us absolutely from her market, to admit this product of that Dominion into our market upon a ridiculously low duty, which is merely nominal, and that must have been imposed with no other idea than that of being nominal, does not comport with my idea of tariff making.

I do not know how carefully the committee has studied this question. It may be that it has gone all over these facts and many others of which I may be ignorant, and may, therefore, have reached a conclusion that is entirely satisfactory to its intelligence and its patriotism; but if it happens that some point of this history has been omitted from the consideration of the committee I hope that mere pride in the authorship of this bill and a mere general intent of not admitting amendments to it proposed by this side of the Chamber will not interfere with a fair consideration of this question.

I have not asked for even the Payne-Aldrich duty, although it was a reduction of 50 per cent from the old duty. I have asked only for a duty of 20 per cent upon the product, with the countervailing provision that we must get into Canada upon the same terms that Canada comes into the United States. I hope, therefore, that if the Senator from Missouri who has charge of this schedule is not ready to make decisive answer at this moment he will take time for reflection and ascertain whether this is just what ought to be done for a great American industry.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, practically all gypsum imported into the United States comes from Canada. In 1912 we produced \$12,800,000 worth of gypsum and gypsum products.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator. I thought he was through.

Mr. CUMMINS. I had finished save for one question. Has it come to the knowledge of the committee that Canada originally imposed a duty of a dollar and a half a ton upon wall plaster, but, finding that that would not entirely protect her market against the invasion of the American product, had advanced her duty from a dollar and a half to two dollars and a half per ton?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not think what Canada or any other country does is important in reference to imposing duties upon gypsum when the fact remains, which I was about to state, that we produced \$12,800,000 worth in 1912 against \$566,000 worth of importations; or, in other words, we make of gypsum and gypsum products about twenty-two times as much as we import.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that, and I know the force of it; but with commodities manufactured in adjoining countries, assuming that they are manufactured at about the same cost, when one country bars us out of her market with a duty of two dollars and a half per ton does the Senator intend to take the position that he is satisfied to allow that country to compete in our market under a nominal duty?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that proposition might be applied to almost every commodity we import. We might be asked by Senators on the other side, who advocate distinctively a protective duty, whether there is reason for it or not; whether we ought not to insist in every case that we will not permit their commodities, their manufactures, or their productions to be imported into our country and admitted to our markets unless they consent to allow our productions and commodities and manufactures to go into their markets on equal terms.

Mr. President, I do not take that view in the aspect of the case as presented. There may be exceptional instances for adopting that policy; but in relation to this particular article we are now considering we produce it largely in the United States, and of that production there is consumed in the United States twenty-two or twenty-three times as much as we import.

Our importations come chiefly from Canada, comparatively little coming from other countries. For example, last year we imported of gypsum and gypsum products \$566,000 worth, of which there came from Canada \$437,155 worth. I have the figures here before me, running back through a series of years, showing a similar comparison. Canada is the producer whose products are entered for competition on our markets.

Mr. President, when we are producing so vastly more than our competitor produces or offers for market here, we might

as well ask, Are we fronting a condition where we need fear this competition?

Then, Mr. President, we are brought to answer this question: For what purposes are gypsum and gypsum products used? They are used in making plaster far more largely than in anything else, and in wall plasters, in paints, and in fertilizers. Gypsum is a fertilizer, and is so used in the country. There is a growing demand for it as a fertilizer.

I heard the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] the other day and other Senators on the other side speaking with wailing voice and almost with tears pearly down their cheeks about the ingratitude and the inattention of the Democratic Party to the welfare of the farmers of the country. Here is one instance where we are proposing to reduce duty to give to the farmers of this country a cheaper fertilizing product, and the Senator from Iowa comes and asks us to postpone the consideration of this paragraph and appeals to us to take into consideration whether we should not increase the duty imposed by the pending bill by doubling the rate proposed in the interest of some concern in the great agricultural State of Iowa, one of the greatest in the Union. Yet, Mr. President, the fact remains that we have practically no competition with the world and practically no competition with Canada in the sale in our market of this product, used, as I have said, for various purposes, and, among others, for fertilizing the lands in Iowa; though, I may say in passing, the lands of Iowa need little fertilization, but they may need it in the future. They are like the lands in Missouri; but there are other States where the agricultural lands do need to be fertilized. The Senator, I think, is making a request of the committee that is hardly warranted by the facts, and, so far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of granting it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the State of Missouri or any other State of which the Senator who has just taken his seat knows use a large amount of gypsum rock as a fertilizer?

Mr. STONE. As I have just said to the Senator, the virgin lands of Missouri up to date have not needed much fertilization, and I do not think the virgin lands of Iowa need much fertilization; but I do say that, according to the statistics and the evidence furnished by the Geological Survey, to which I refer the Senator, gypsum and its products are used and can be used to very great advantage as a fertilizer, and we want to give the farmers of the country cheap fertilizer. I should like to know whether the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] favors that?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that there is some gypsum used for fertilizing.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. A very great deal of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is used, I apprehend, mainly in the East. Fortunately, we have better use for it in the West. But the Senator from Missouri is always delightfully entertaining and charmingly insincere [laughter]—and I do not say that in any disparaging way—because he knows how to reach his object, and just now he has sought to reach it by retorting upon my friend from Kansas on account of his solicitude for the farmer. I want the Senator from Missouri, however, to know that while we have concern for the farmer, we also have concern for the manufacturer.

If I believed that a duty of 20 per cent on a product that is not worth more than a dollar a ton in its crude state would be a burden upon the farmers who had occasion to use it as a fertilizer I might surrender my convictions to the eloquence of my friend from Missouri. But I know and the Senator from Missouri knows that it would be no burden if this duty were advanced to 20 per cent.

The high-priced product is wall plaster. By far the larger part of the domestic product in value is the hard plaster. The effect of what is proposed by the Democratic side of this Chamber is, in the first place, to allow Canada to supply New England, or a part of New England, from Nova Scotia, where the gypsum rock is found in large quantities. The second thing that will be accomplished is to allow the Canadian factories to supply the western part of our country with hard plaster simply because she may have some advantage in freight rates to certain parts of our Western States.

Personally I do not believe a duty of 20 per cent will change the price of this commodity one farthing. If it were made free, I do not believe it would change the price a farthing. What it will do, however, is to shut up a part of our market, so far as the domestic producers are concerned, and give that market to Canada. There are parts of Canada that we can reach more cheaply than they can be reached from the Canadian factories. I want the chance to go to Canada to sell our output. I want you to give us the same chance there that you intend to give Canada in certain parts of the United States.

Mr. STONE. May I ask my friend why Canada puts a wall of two dollars or two dollars and a half a ton on gypsum against the United States unless she is afraid the United States will invade her market?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can tell the Senator from Missouri why Canada puts a duty of two dollars and a half a ton on gypsum.

Mr. STONE. Is it because Canada thinks we can produce it here, from our gypsum quarries, with our labor, and carry it into Canada and sell it there so much cheaper than they can produce it there?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Missouri can not drive me into any inconsistency about that. I know why Canada put a duty of two dollars and a half a ton upon this commodity. It was because we would have taken her markets if the duty had not been imposed. In these days, however, markets are very largely a matter of cost of transportation. If Canada allowed us free entry into her borders, I think we could compete with Canada in the United States without any duty whatever. This is not a protective duty in the proper sense of the word. It is an effort to expand the commerce of the United States. It is an effort to give us a fair chance to do business outside of the United States.

You put a countervailing duty upon wheat. I agree that it can not be said as to every commodity that we must insist upon the same rate as a condition of entering a foreign market that we impose as a condition of entering our market. That could not be asserted as a general principle. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that we must take account of all the circumstances and conditions which surround us in determining whether or not that ought to be done.

But I should like to have the Senator from Missouri tell me a good reason for putting a countervailing duty on wheat that will not apply to a duty upon hard wall plaster. We produce a very large amount of both. Our resources are practically unlimited as to both. Yet you have said in this bill that Canada can not bring her wheat into the United States free until she permits us to enter her markets free. I ask you to say the same thing with regard to this enterprise. If you can give me any good reason for differentiating between the two products, I should like to hear it.

We are here legislating, as I suppose, for the good of the American people. We want to preserve, so far as we can, our home markets, and we want to widen and broaden our markets in other countries. We want an opportunity for every American who is willing to work to work a full day and as many days of the year as he may be willing to employ himself. The result of his labor must be sold either in our own markets or in the markets of foreign countries. It is just as much your duty, when you come to an enterprise like this, to see that we have a fair chance in Canada as it is to see that our laboring men are employed to supply the American market.

If I agree with you therefore—and I am not prepared to dispute it, because I do not know; I have not investigated it—that there is no difference in the cost of production, if I assume it, when I know and you know that this commodity is being sold all over the United States under competitive conditions at the lowest possible price that will yield any profit whatever to those who are engaged in it, you must concede that the duty that has been put upon it does not affect in any degree whatever the price, if we can produce it as cheaply as it can be produced in Canada.

Under these circumstances, if these statements be true, to stand here and weakly surrender our chance abroad, to stand here and weakly allow Canada to exclude us from her borders while throwing wide open the gates for her products, is to me as indefensible as it is mysterious. I can not understand that way of making a tariff law. I can not understand that way of taking care of the people of this country. We want as many men engaged in making gypsum and hard plaster as we can put to work; and if we are making it as cheaply as they are making it abroad, if it is being sold under competition, as it is, if it is being sold at a low price, as it is, why, in the name of justice, will you not do something to batter down the high wall that Canada has built up between herself and the United States and give our people who can reach certain parts of Canada under more advantageous conditions than her own factories an opportunity to supply those markets?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have received from constituents at home a statement on this question which is addressed to Congress, issued by the president of the United States Gypsum Co. It is very brief, and I ask that the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES. I could not hear the request of the Senator. What was it?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That a document on this subject be read.

Mr. JAMES. Who is the document from or by?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The document is from the United States Gypsum Co. It is their statement on this question. I ask that it may be read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CONCERNING THE TARIFF ON GYPSUM.
(Schedule B.—H. R. 3321, sec. 76.)

To the honorable Members of the Sixty-third Congress, United States Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The present tariff on crude gypsum rock is 30 cents a ton, and \$1.75 on manufactured gypsum products. The proposed rate is 10 per cent ad valorem, which means practically no duty, while Canada maintains a prohibitive tariff of \$2.50 against entry of our manufactured product. The proposed tariff will virtually give Canada the benefit of free trade. Approximately 400,000 tons is imported from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into New York. At Caledonia and Paris, Ontario, there are three gypsum mills whose products can be turned into western New York and Pennsylvania markets immediately. This will interfere with the American mills in Oakfield, Akron, Garbutt, and Wheatland, N. Y., and Michigan mills at Grand Rapids, Grandville, and Alabaster will likewise suffer from this competition. There are two large Canadian mills at Winnipeg which have forced six manufacturers at Fort Dodge, Iowa, out of Canadian markets through the aid of the present Canadian tariff of \$2.50. These Winnipeg mills now have an open field and are assailing the trade of six American gypsum companies in Iowa, two in South Dakota, one in Montana, one in Oregon, and one in Washington. The Canadians, as you are already aware, treat their tariff in a very different fashion than is customary in the United States. They evidently set out to prohibit the use of our products and imposed, at first, a duty of \$1.50. They also have a clause which prevents dumping, and have not hesitated to send their inspectors to our offices to determine that no lower prices were being made in Canada than our average mill price received for American markets. Finding that the \$1.50 rate just mentioned was insufficient, they added \$1 on it, and at once accomplished their purpose, which is effective at the present time, and will be doubly so when all our border markets are thrown open to their industries and we stand defenseless in the open outside their walls.

On the other hand, if it were the inclination of Canada to treat us as well as we treat her at the present, which treatment will be even more generous under the proposed tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem, the American gypsum industry would be willing to forego such tariff entirely and favor free trade if such concession were necessary to warrant and obtain reciprocity from Canada, but the improbability of Canadian reciprocity makes it imperative, in the interest of those American properties mentioned above, that the present rate or increased tariff be strictly maintained.

Respectfully,

UNITED STATES GYPSUM CO.,
S. L. AVERY, President.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who has presented that document if it is not a fact that the United States Gypsum Co. is practically the owner of all the companies and mills that have been recited?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And that it is in fact a Gypsum Trust?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suppose the Senator would tack on the word "trust" to any company or corporation which makes anything in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will take out the word "trust," then. Has not the United States Gypsum Co. an absolute monopoly of this industry?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know nothing about the company, Mr. President. I stated to the Senate, when I asked that the document be read, that it had been forwarded to me by several of my constituents, who, I presume, are stockholders in the company. I do not know where it is located, or what dividends it pays, or whether it has any watered stock, or anything of the kind.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not even know whether it was organized in New Jersey, does he?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not. If it is a trust, I suppose it did not get far from New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] seems to treat rather majestically and lightly the question of gypsum as a fertilizer. It may be, as has been stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], that in the rich fertility of the lands in the State of that Senator and in the State of Iowa they know no such thing as using gypsum as a fertilizer, but gypsum is a universal fertilizer in my part of the world. I have bought many tons of it in my life. It is a universal fertilizer for clover and vegetation of that character, and in the form of plaster of Paris it enters directly into the home of every man, woman, and child in the country.

Where there are a few mill owners that may be, directly or indirectly, detrimentally affected by this tariff there are a million and one householders that are more seriously affected. The day was, as almost all of us will remember, when the plaster of a house was of a very soft character. You could dig

it out with your finger nail. But with the improved system of using calcined plaster—Keene's cement, as we term it—and plaster of Paris it becomes as hard as adamant and is known in many instances as adamant plaster.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he knows who controls the industry of manufacturing gypsum in Canada?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. GRONNA. Then, if the product of that country is in the hands of a trust, what reason has the Senator to believe that the foreign trust would be more reasonable in their prices than they are in the United States?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know nothing about the situation there.

Mr. LODGE. A foreign trust is all right.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am informed and believe, however, that while "trust" is naturally an unpleasant word to the other side—it has been your death knell, and it will keep you buried for many years—this combination or corporation, or whatever else you may term it, known as the United States Gypsum Co., owns these mills. I say, while there may be a few mills that may be affected detrimentally and disastrously, there are a million and one householders who are affected by the tariff on this product. Everyone who builds a small cabin today instead of having his ceiling plastered nearly an inch thick with plaster that is liable to fall off and do damage to those beneath is now using a thin skin of Keene's cement, if you choose, or adamant, or plaster of Paris. All these things affect every householder. As a builder, having used it in some 85 houses, I say God speed the day of cheaper adamant, cheaper plaster, cheaper plaster of Paris.

Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KENYON, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest to Senators that we are getting into the chorus business again.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator another question before he takes his seat?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENYON. Who has the floor, Mr. President?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think my friend from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to ask the Senator from New Jersey a question. He seems to be an expert in building; but I think he is mistaken in saying that he would prefer a thick coat of plaster to a very thin one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I did not say that. The Senator misinterpreted what I said. I said that in days past a thick coat of plaster was used; and probably in the structure of this very building there are instances where you will find an inch of plaster, or mortar. It was not plaster; it was a material so soft that it could be dug out with the finger nail. But the invention of what is known as Keene's cement, adamant, or plaster of Paris, has reduced the thickness necessary until it is now a mere shell or skin, answering the same purpose, making lighter ceilings, and hence a blessing. So it enters into everybody's household, and I can not understand why my friend from Iowa should stand up and make such a defense of the farmer. Why, the day will come in the very near future when you will need plaster of Paris every day, and as builders we need it all the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Jersey undertake to guarantee that we will have cheaper plaster because we are going to buy it from a trust in Canada?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can only say that I can not get it out of my mind that a tariff is a tax, and that if the tariff does not increase the price it defeats the purpose for which it is levied. It does increase the price. I am not worried about Canada; Canada can take care of herself. I am worrying about the American people.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to correct one statement that was made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE]. I did not rise to "start anything"; but I simply wish to say that I think the United States Gypsum Co. in its inception was intended to be a trust, and to take in all the gypsum mills of the country. They failed in that, however, so that in my home town, Fort Dodge, there are some five or six independent concerns engaged in competition. I dislike a trust as much as does the Senator from New Jersey.

I can add nothing to what has been said by the senior Senator from Iowa on the subject of Canadian competition and the Canadian market. There is a theory about this matter, how-

ever, that I desire to call very seriously to the attention of my Democratic friends.

It is true, as my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] has said, that the gypsum industry is the main industry of Fort Dodge. That is my home, and that was Senator Dolliver's home; but I am not pleading for any protection to the industry because of local interest. In fact, it is one of the schedules that I shall ask to be excused from voting on, because one member of my family happens to have a little stock in one of the mills; and although that member of my family is not of my political persuasion, I have such a conviction that Members of Congress ought not to vote on schedules in which they or any members of their families may be at all interested that I shall not vote on the gypsum schedule, and I am not going to discuss the merits of it.

That industry, however, was a thriving industry in Fort Dodge. Senator Dolliver, as the Members of the Senate know, in the tariff fight of 1909 broke away from his party and conducted a vigorous and courageous fight to reduce the tariff duties on woolen goods. He fought Schedule K. This reduction in the Payne-Aldrich Act was made, as I firmly believe, and his friends firmly believed, for no purpose in the world but for revenge as to Senator Dolliver. The then chairman of the Finance Committee cut the gypsum tariff to the quick in order to humiliate him at home, and to show that he had no influence in the Halls of Congress. That is the reason the tariff duties were cut on gypsum in the Payne-Aldrich Act.

Before that time Senator Dolliver, who had earned a place on the Finance Committee by long years of service, was denied that place; and then, on top of that, these duties were cut. That is the reason of the cut in those duties. There is no use in beating around the bush on that proposition at all. That did not accomplish its purpose, however. It did not discredit Senator Dolliver in his home. It did not drive him out of the Republican Party, because our people at home honored him all the more, even if their industries were to suffer. They honored him for his courage and his bravery and his manhood in fighting the high tariff duties of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Mr. President, I am sorry that after that has been done in the Payne-Aldrich bill our Democratic friends go still further and cut that tariff in two. That was a tariff duty, levied, not for protection, not for revenue, but for revenge; and I am sorry the process has to go on any further.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I had risen for another purpose; but after what has been said by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], I think I ought to say, as a member of the Finance Committee of 1909, that if the duty on gypsum was reduced for purposes of revenge on Senator Dolliver it certainly was not known to the members of the Finance Committee. I had no such knowledge, and I do not know of any other Senator who had.

Mr. KENYON. I did not say the members of the committee did it. I specifically charged it to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. This is all news to me, Mr. President. I did not suppose there was any such motive in the reduction at that time. But what I rose to call attention to was what I think has been overlooked—that the provisions of this section, and the opposition to the proviso offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], arise from the introduction into this bill of an entirely new economic theory in the imposition of tariff duties.

Hitherto it has generally been supposed, I think, by all economists that there were two opposing theories in the imposition of tariff duties. One was that known as the free-trade theory; the other the theory of imposing a duty for the purpose of protection of domestic industries. Of course, "tariff for revenue only" is a mere political phrase. It is not a theory, and no tariff for revenue only can exist. A duty may be imposed for revenue only, but a tariff throughout can not exist for revenue only, because if you once impose duties generally you are bound to have some duties produce protection.

This bill has free-trade provisions, protective provisions, and what may be called tariff-for-revenue duties, I suppose. It certainly illustrates and combines the two great conflicting theories in the imposition of tariff duties. But it has introduced a third theory, and a wholly new one, and that is the imposition of duties in such a manner as to give protection to the foreign competitor. That, I think I am not mistaken in saying, is a novel idea. I have pointed it out in one or two instances already, where the duty is raised on the raw material, or kept at the same rate, while it is lowered on the manufactured article.

Now, in this particular case our only competitor in regard to gypsum is Canada. I am not quite clear what the fertilizer proposition has to do with the only duty in the paragraph which the Senator from Iowa has tried to amend. I suppose

the product mentioned in the first line would come under fertilizer. The cements, of course, have nothing to do with fertilizers. I thought before I spoke there was a separate duty on crude gypsum, but I see there is not. It is proposed to lower the duty to such a rate that our market will be open to Canadian competition, while Canada will not admit us to her market. That is hardly a fair basis of competition. The only argument in behalf of it is that our production is worth \$12,000,000 a year, and it is proposed to give entrance to that great market to Canada and get nothing in return.

Then, we hear the old song that it will lower prices. What possible reason is there to suppose that the Canadian manufacturers are coming in here to lower prices? They live on the same continent with us. Their wages probably do not differ materially. They could not sell very much lower. Neither their natural advantages nor their economic advantages are sufficient to enable them to do that. They will undoubtedly want to make as much as the traffic will bear. It is a simple gift of our market to the Canadian producer without any return.

Further, it is legislation along the line of the new theory of giving protection advantage to the foreign producer. We are told, I think without sufficient authority, judging from what has been said by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], that there is a trust in this country. There is no reason to suppose there is not another trust over the line in Canada. But the American trust or monopoly from which our Democratic friends shrink with horror has no alarm for them when it comes in pleasant foreign dress.

Mr. President, I merely wanted to call attention to what seemed to me the underlying principle here. I have not examined the case sufficiently to know the details in the labor cost, and I should not enter into it if I had. The Senator from Iowa has covered the entire case; it could not have been done better; and it seems to me there is no answer to the argument he made for the proviso he has proposed. I merely wish to call attention to the underlying theory which lies in the result of this duty and the resistance to the proviso and many other duties imposed in this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply want to say a few words.

The Senator from Iowa referred to the uses of this material. I have some familiarity with it, because it is used rather extensively in my part of the country, and especially for purposes of the fertilization of land. It is a substance very similar to lime. Of course, it is a superior substance in every way, but it is used for almost the identical purposes for which lime is used. Lime is used for plastering houses, and so is gypsum. Lime is used as a fertilizer, and so is gypsum. Neither lime nor gypsum is in the proper sense a fertilizer; that is to say, it does not add anything to the fertility of the soil directly, but both are used upon sour soil, such as we have in the South, and which, I suppose, they have in some States in the West, for the purpose of liberating certain imprisoned properties of productivity in the soil. In one year there were sold in the city of Norfolk 30,000 tons of this material for use upon the soil of the surrounding country.

Mr. President, there are in the United States, I think, 82 factories or mills engaged in manufacturing this material. This crude gypsum material is called land plaster when it is used as a fertilizer. Five of those factories are located upon the coast; the other 77 factories are located in the interior of the country.

Crude gypsum is found in various parts of this country—in New York, West Virginia, and in various States in the interior.

There is absolutely no competition, and in the nature of things there can be no competition, between the gypsum produced in the 77 factories that are located in the interior of this country and the gypsum produced in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for the very simple reason that on account of its bulky character and its low value—about \$1.17 per ton—high transportation cost makes competition in the interior impossible.

The only competition that exists or can in the nature of things exist, whatever the tariff rate may be, is within a zone of, say, 100 miles along the coast. The five factories located on the coast are the only ones that have complained, so far as I know, of the duty in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit me, I should like to say that competition may prevail along the border on the Lakes. It is the mills and manufacturing in Michigan that would naturally sell their product to Canada if there were not prohibitive duties there, and to prohibit the factories in Michigan from crossing the border by a duty of two and a half dollars and voluntarily give to the Canadian manufacturer our market in Michigan at a paltry 10 per cent ad valorem looks to me to be a little reckless.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know that there are any of these factories located upon the Lakes, nor do I know what would be the cost of transportation from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to the points the Senator speaks of.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not speaking of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is about the only part of Canada where it is produced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am speaking of the place where it is produced immediately on the border, in the Central West; and I ask you why you should give Canada our State as a market in the face of the fact that they have erected an absolutely impassable wall over which we can not go with our product to the Canadian market?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we have not given nor will this bill give Canada the market of the interior. As I have just explained, so far as the committee was advised—and we had a good deal of data upon this subject—we were advised that there could be no competition by reason of freight rates with reference to the 77 factories located in the interior of the country. If there are some factories located on the Lakes, I do not know what that situation would be. They might be in the same position as the factories located upon the coast.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is because I do know—

Mr. SIMMONS. The factories located upon the Lake would have the same position as the factory located upon the coast.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is because they are located at my home, it is because hundreds of men are employed in that industry, that I ask you not to present the American market to Canada as a free gift, when they are building a protection wall so high we can not possibly take our product there.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator know the difference between the freight rate to the point he speaks of in his State and the freight rate from Nova Scotia to New York?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know it is the water rate, and not only from Lake Michigan but the shore of Lake Superior, Lake Huron, and Lake Erie, and it is the cheapest possible rate. While we could take our products there if we have an opportunity, why you should level our protection against Canada now developing this industry to proportions which ought at least to have our serious consideration, when they are at the same moment constructing a tariff wall so high that we can not sell our products to them, is beyond my calculation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we have not leveled the wall. We have retained in this bill an ample duty to give the American producer, either on the seacoast or the Lakes, under even the Republican theory of protection, sufficient advantage to compensate the difference between any cost here and in Canada. There is but little difference, if any, in the cost of producing this material in Canada and in this country. In Canada they have practically the same scale of wages that we have in the United States. In Canada gypsum is found in the bowels of the earth and can be gotten out of the bowels of the earth under their system of labor just as cheap as it can be gotten out of the bowels of the earth under our system of labor. There is practically no difference in labor or material cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If that be so, why can not Canada compete with us with the same rate of duty? If Canada can produce it as cheaply as we can, and she does, why does Canada want to build up a wall so high we can not compete with Canada after we are giving her an opportunity to compete with us?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not explain to the Senator the reason for Canadian duties. Canada has duties upon a great many things that she can produce as cheaply as we can produce. It is not to be assumed that all the Canadian duties are leveled at the United States. Canadian tariff laws apply to the world, I assume, just as our tariff laws apply to the world.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will let me develop the idea I have in my mind I will be glad to yield to him in a minute.

Mr. CUMMINS. I intended to ask a question in regard to that very point.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, go ahead.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it was the year before; Canada advanced her duty to \$2.50 a ton; possibly it may have been longer than that—I am speaking now of my State—we sent into Canada, toward Winnipeg, in one year 100 carloads of plaster. Now, I ask the Senator from North Carolina whether he thinks

it is his duty to help, if we can be helped without injury to the country at large, to regain that market?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator very frankly that so far as I am personally concerned I should like to see a countervailing duty upon a great many things that are produced mutually in Canada and in this country, but I do not think this is a case similar to that of wheat and flour. Mr. President, if we can pay these Canadian duties and sell this material in large quantities to Canada, it shows we can produce it cheaper than Canada and need not fear Canadian competition.

I think the Senators are laboring under the mistaken assumption that the 425,000 tons of gypsum we imported last year was manufactured or calcined gypsum, whereas it was crude gypsum. The importations of manufactures of gypsum are negligible.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from North Carolina got that idea from me I was faulty in expression. I think a very large part of the imports was of the crude material used for fertilizing in New England and Eastern States.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, we are large producers of crude gypsum in this country. As I said, it is found in various States, in various localities, and in considerable quantities.

In 1911 we mined in the United States 2,323,970 tons of crude gypsum. In 1910 the entire production of crude gypsum in the Dominion of Canada amounted to only 525,000 tons. So Canada is not much of a producer of crude gypsum and we would not be in much danger of being overwhelmed with Canadian importations of gypsum even if the whole Canadian output was imported.

I can not see, Mr. President, any reason why this duty should be higher than we have fixed it in the bill. When you consider the fact that the labor cost here, even from the Republican standpoint, and in Nova Scotia is about the same, that it is a mineral product and the labor cost of mining is small, I can not see the necessity of a larger duty than 10 per cent, even from the protection standpoint. It is twice as high as the duty which we put upon lime, which, as I said before, is used practically for the same purpose. This would seem a case where the Republican argument that a duty is needed to equalize difference in labor cost does not apply, for there is no difference.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to enter into a discussion of this matter, but as I was a member of the Finance Committee in 1909 I wish to say that I never heard it intimated by Senator Aldrich or any member of that committee that the reduction of the duty on crude gypsum was made as a revenge against the then senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Utah is now replying to what my colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa, said.

Mr. SMOOT. The junior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I may say, however, in justice to my colleague, who is not here at this moment, I have never made it a subject of discussion, although I know that Senator Dolliver so believed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I never heard it before intimated, and it came as a surprise to me to-day that that intimation should be now made. I simply state that as a matter of history.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon, but he was addressing himself in a somewhat low tone of voice to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and I caught just enough of what he said to make me somewhat interested in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say for the information of the Senator from Missouri that I stated that I was a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate in 1909, when the present tariff law was framed and passed, and that I never heard it intimated before to-day that the rate upon crude gypsum was reduced as a revenge upon the then Senator from Iowa, Mr. Dolliver. I repeat, I was very much surprised to hear it to-day, because it is the first time that I ever heard it intimated. I say this by way of information and that alone.

I do remember, Mr. President, that at that time the reduction of duty on that article was discussed. My own State of Utah produced crude gypsum, and the great bulk of the shipments from my State went to California. I tried to have the then existing rate of 50 cents per ton maintained, and I remember the argument then made was that it was a fertilizer used in the Eastern States, that it was shipped direct from Nova Scotia, and that the freight rate from the interior part of the country was so great that the duty could not be maintained without

working a great hardship upon the people of the border States. That was the argument and the only argument that was made at that time which I ever heard. I was then opposed to the reduction of the duty to 30 cents a ton, and no doubt former Senator Dolliver would sustain this statement if he were in the Chamber to-day.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], in discussing this matter a few moments ago, to say that the cost of production in this country was no greater or even less than it was in Canada.

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; I said that I had not investigated the question; but, generally speaking, I do not believe that it costs any more to make a thing here than it costs to make it in Canada. It was simply from that general view which I have of the level of prices in both countries that I made the statement which I did.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, whatever may have been the purpose of the committee which had control of the formation of the Payne-Aldrich bill in reducing the tariff upon gypsum, if it was to punish Senator Dolliver's friends who manufactured gypsum because he had differed from them upon various schedules in that tariff bill, it did not serve its purpose. While we have been so often assured that the Payne-Aldrich bill was a bill framed for protection, as most Senators on the other side were glad to say, but, I always thought, for plunder, now we have found out that it had also another ingredient in it—that of punishment. That, however, is not our purpose here.

Personally, I had great affection for Senator Dolliver; I thought, and I yet think, that he was one of the greatest men who ever sat in this Senate; but however much I may revere his memory, I am not content that a duty in this bill shall remain prohibitive because the factories which are engaged in the manufacture of the article happen to be in the city which claimed him and honored him so highly and loved him so greatly.

In 1905 there were practically \$370,000 worth of this gypsum imported into this country under the Dingley bill rate. After the duty was lowered in the Payne-Aldrich bill in the year 1912 only \$400,000 worth of it was imported here.

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg pardon, but may I interrupt the Senator from Kentucky?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. The amount just mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky includes gypsum rock, ground gypsum, and calcined gypsum, as well as the article to which he refers.

Mr. JAMES. So much more the reason why this duty ought to be reduced. The production in this country in the year 1912 was \$12,000,000 worth. I have always understood that the Republican policy of protection was based upon the theory that the tariff should equal the cost of production—that is, the difference in the cost of labor—between this and the foreign country. Now, it is not contended here that we can not produce this article as cheaply as they can produce it in Canada. I believe we can produce it cheaper than they can in Canada, and I believe the argument the Senator from Iowa has made—that Canada imposed a high tariff rate upon gypsum and then had to increase it in order to keep our United States manufacturers from taking their market—shows that we can produce it here cheaper than they can produce it there.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JAMES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. If all that be true, does the Senator from Kentucky think that his entire duty is discharged when he attaches a revenue impost upon this article? Does he not think that he ought to do something to open up the markets of Canada to our people? If we can produce the commodity more cheaply than it can be produced in Canada, why is he not willing to help the American people a little to get into Canada, if by trying to do so he will not increase the price one penny in his own country?

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, all the argument the Senator has made has been for the manufacturer. He seems to see only the manufacturer. The Senator loses sight of the consumer. I am not willing to give this market to the manufacturer of gypsum or plaster rock simply because the Senator argues that if we do not put the duty high enough Canada will come into this country and will take the market away from the American manufacturer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Kentucky believe that the duty which has been imposed upon this article has affected its price one particle?

Mr. JAMES. If the duty which has been imposed upon this article has not affected its price, then certainly the reduction of the duty will not affect its price.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; but after we have agreed on all that, will not the Senator do a little to enable us to sell this commodity in Canada?

Mr. JAMES. That argument, Mr. President, carried to a finality, would mean that you never would get tariff duties reduced at all. In Canada they will say, "We have a rate now of \$2.50 per ton, and if we reduce that rate at all the United States will take our market." Then in the United States they will say, "If you reduce at all the rate of duty on that commodity the Canadian will take our market"; and thus the consumer will be ground between the upper and nether millstones.

Personally, so far as I am individually concerned, I believe that we ought to consider first the question of obtaining revenue, and it ought to be obtained from those articles that will bear least heavily upon the consumer. Here is an article that goes into the building of homes in this country. Forty-five million of our people to-night will sleep in homes they do not own. The reduction of this tariff will make it easier for them to own a home. I believe we ought to look out for them just a little, instead of looking out for the Canadian market for the manufacturers in the Senator's own State.

Mr. CUMMINS. I notice, however, that the Senator from Kentucky has agreed in this bill that if the President finds that any country is discriminating unduly against us the duty shall be raised. I should like to hear the Senator explain the two doctrines, and tell us if they do not conflict with each other?

Mr. JAMES. In the first place, as to this article, there is no discrimination against us by Canada. Canada will simply come into this country and sell in competition with our manufacturers, provided she can by paying the 10 per cent duty; but the Senator has told us she can not, and that the Canadians could not even hold their own market unless a duty of \$2.50 a ton was placed on gypsum.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not say that.

Mr. JAMES. What did the Senator say?

Mr. CUMMINS. I said there were certain parts of Canada that we could enter because of the cheaper cost of transportation. The truth is that regarding all such commodities as these the great protection is in the cost of transportation. Canada can get to certain parts of our country, no matter what reasonable duty is placed upon this commodity, and we can get to certain parts of Canada more cheaply than Canada can, with any kind of a reasonable duty; but Canada has imposed a prohibitive duty of \$2.50 a ton, which is really, at the present price, probably 60 or 70 per cent of the entire value of the product.

Mr. JAMES. Because Canada wants to give to the manufacturers of gypsum a monopoly upon her people is no reason why we should give to the manufacturers of gypsum the same character of monopoly in this country upon our people.

Mr. President, in this country the production of this commodity is \$12,000,000 worth a year, the revenue derived from the duty now imposed is only \$111,000, and the imports amount to only \$400,000; but we are now told that the tariff must equal the cost of transportation instead of the cost of production. I believe this is a just reduction, and, really, if I had my own way I would place the article on the free list. There is no competition at all under the present tariff rate. We fix the rate at 10 per cent ad valorem in the hope and belief that it will bring both honest competition and produce revenue.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask my friend the Senator from Iowa whether I am correct in the impression I have that he voted against what is known as the bill providing for reciprocal trade relations between the United States and Canada during the last administration?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not referred to the reciprocal provision in this bill—

Mr. STONE. I asked the Senator—

Mr. CUMMINS. Which is that if the President finds that any country is unfairly discriminating against this country or is not recognizing fair and reasonable reciprocal obligations, then an added duty is placed upon certain commodities, thereby recognizing the retaliatory theory.

Mr. STONE. The Senator and I do not quite understand each other. We had here before us some two years ago, I think, a proposition for reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is what it was named; but it was not so in fact.

Mr. STONE. Well, that is not important at present. I do not care to enter into that. I thought it was, but the Senator thinks it was not.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, it was called that.

Mr. STONE. But what I wish to ask of the Senator now is whether I am right in understanding that he opposed that trade pact, that international trade agreement?

Mr. CUMMINS. I opposed the bill to which the Senator refers. I do not call it a trade pact, however.

Mr. STONE. Oh, well, we will not quarrel about mere matters of terms.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not want to assent to the Senator's terminology; that is all.

Mr. STONE. We are agreed that the Senator was opposed to it. How would the Senator now feel if the proposition were made in the Senate of the United States for mutual free trade between the United States and Canada on gypsum?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Iowa has no hesitation whatever in answering that question. He is not as mysterious as he thinks some of his brother Senators are. Guided by what I believe to be the truth with regard to gypsum and its products, if Canada were to agree that our product might enter her markets free, I should be willing to agree that Canada's product should enter the markets of the United States free.

Mr. STONE. In the act to which I have adverted and against which the Senator spoke and voted I find, on examination, that plaster rock or gypsum was put upon the free list as between these two countries.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly; but the trouble—

Mr. STONE. How did that strike the Senator at that time?

Mr. CUMMINS. The difficulty with that bill was precisely the difficulty with the Democratic bill now before the Senate. It had some good things in it, but it had so many bad things in it that no patriot could vote for it, as I viewed the question. There are a lot of good things in the bill now before the Senate—plenty of them—but it has so many inconsistent and indefensible things in it that I can not vote for it. I have no apology to make for voting against the so-called reciprocal agreement with Canada. I believe in reciprocal treaties and I believe in reciprocal trade; I think, however, such agreements can not be effectuated by any general law. I think they must relate to a particular thing, so that there can be intelligent examination and a conclusion with respect to the benefits to be derived from trade in the particular commodity or commodities that are covered by the treaty.

Mr. STONE. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator is through with his explanations and apologies, I should like to have this paragraph disposed of.

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg pardon, Mr. President. What did the Senator say? Did the Senator say "if I am through with my apologies"?

Mr. STONE. I said if the Senator was through with his explanation and apologies. They have been well said; the work has been well done—

Mr. CUMMINS. As I remarked a few moments ago, it is impossible for the Senator from Missouri to be serious.

Mr. STONE. Oh, I am very serious about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, very serious! The Senator from Missouri, in that low tone of his which catches the reporter's ear but often misses the ears of his brother Senators, frequently says something that he does not really mean. I resent a little what he has just said.

Mr. STONE. Then I withdraw it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly; I knew the Senator would withdraw it, because when he speaks so that everybody can hear he always tells the truth as he understands it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the argument in favor—

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I got up to make a few innocuous observations of my own.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not the least objection in the world to the Senator doing so, but somebody called me and said that the Senator from Mississippi desired to ask me a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to make "a few unnecessary remarks," as the dorky said about John Allen's speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the argument underlying the theory of countervailing duties is as old as is the spirit of retaliation, and there never was a particle of sense in it. When you reduce it to its ultimate analysis it is this: One country says to another country, "If you do not quit punishing your people by refusing to let them have valuable things from my country at a cheap price, I will punish my people by refusing to let them have valuable things from your country at a cheap price." So they go on forever retaliating under the guise of reciprocating. The consequence is that one country builds its tax laws upon the

example set by another country, instead of building its tax laws upon the necessities and conditions of its own people without regard to anybody else.

As I understand, a ton of gypsum rock is worth at present about a dollar and a half. If so, if you put a tax of 10 per cent upon it, you would possibly raise its price, if imported from Canada, to \$1.65; or if it were sold in the American market by the American producer and he feared Canadian importations, or if Canadian importations threatened his market, the price might be lower than that.

As I understood the Senator from Iowa, he said a moment ago, I believe, that 60 carloads of gypsum rock had gone from his own country up to Winnipeg; in how short a time I have forgotten.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much was it the Senator said went to Winnipeg?

Mr. CUMMINS. I said that in one year we shipped to Winnipeg 100 carloads of plaster; not gypsum rock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I thought it was 60 carloads, or rather, I remembered it wrongly. One hundred carloads of plaster, then, were shipped in that one year to Winnipeg; and that was at a time when Canada had what duty?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not remember whether at that time Canada had a duty of \$1.50 or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Afterwards she raised it to \$2.50.

Mr. CUMMINS. But it was at a time, of course, when the eastern mills in Canada could not get to Winnipeg on anything like the freight rate that we could reach Winnipeg.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, now, we shipped 100 carloads in one year to Winnipeg, paying a Canadian duty of \$1.50 a ton.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not sure about the duty at the time of these shipments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At any rate, we paid the Canadian duty, whatever it was.

Mr. CUMMINS. We paid whatever the Canadian duty was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We paid the duty and shipped it. It does not look from that as if we were in danger of any great flood of Canadian gypsum coming into our country. The Senator from Iowa, with his usual candor and intellectual integrity, has admitted that so far as he knows the cost of production is about the same in the two countries, the cost of labor being about the same, and the other factors that enter into the cost of production being about the same.

There is nothing in the world more absurd than having a gypsum bed on the American side of the Canadian line and another gypsum bed on the Canadian side of the American line, and fixing a tax which must be paid upon the American side by the American farmers and the American constructors and fixing a tax upon the Canadian side that must be paid by the Canadian farmers and the Canadian constructors. If anything is more absurd than protectionism itself, it is levying these duties where both sides admit that taking the entire line from east to west, if there were absolute free trade it would be about as fair for one as for the other. I should like to see free trade in gypsum between the two countries—in fact, free trade in everything. I think it would be a good thing if the United States and Canada could enter into a zollverein—a customs union—of some sort.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment I will. But the Senator can not state a single reason for the application of a countervailing duty on gypsum that would not apply to every other product produced in both countries; and he can not make an argument in favor of it, if his purpose in raising our duty is to force Canada to lower hers, that is not an argument in favor of freer trade and therefore an argument in favor of what we on this side would welcome as readily as he.

I do not believe you can force Canada into lowering her duties upon gypsum by raising our duties upon gypsum, because according to the Senator's own statement we have the better of Canada in cheapness of production or, at any rate, in the ability to sell cheaply, whether it be from transportation rates, cheapness of production, or what not, as is evidenced by the fact that, although we have had a very stiff duty to pay, we shipped 100 carloads to Canada from one place in this country during one year.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is a notion prevalent in certain quarters that Canada is ready to enter into free trade with the United States. That is a mistaken notion, as I

chance to know myself. Certainly under the Laurier government the public men of Canada over and over declared that they would not enter into free trade with the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Senator understand me to say that Canada was ready to enter into free trade with us?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I did not. My observation is made simply to disabuse the minds of some people who have said to me that Canada was ready for that. I know that Canada has not been ready for it, for the reason that Canada wants to keep out our manufactured products.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I think the Senator is right.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think Canada has committed the very foolish error of undertaking to build up her manufactures at the expense of her people generally. I think she is worshipping the idol almost as much as we ever did, and that nothing will convert her from its worship for some years to come. I did not say that. What I said was that I should like to see it. I know that the free trade that stretches from the State of Washington to the State of Florida, and from the State of Maine to the State of Texas, has been the chief cause of the prosperity and upbuilding of this country, and that if a customs union applied from the frozen seas to the Panama Canal it would build up all of this North American country. Therefore I expressed the idea that I should like to see it, as far as I was concerned. No; Canada has not yet progressed that far.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. There is one element in the cost of producing gypsum which I think the Senator from Iowa overlooked in making his statement, and that is the cost of the crude material. In Nova Scotia the crude material is found on the seashore and on the surface. It is mined and produced almost exactly as iron ore is produced in the Mesabi Range, practically with a steam shovel, while the crude gypsum in the United States is mined or quarried, and the cost of producing it is materially greater. It does not strike me as important from the standpoint of the Senator from Mississippi that we paid \$1.50 a ton duty for sending 100 carloads of finished gypsum into Canada, and were able to do it, because the freight rate from any point where it was then produced in Canada was so much greater than the duty that it was absolutely necessary that the inhabitants of Winnipeg should buy at a nearer point than the producing point in Canada. For instance, the freight rate to Washington from a producing plant in Virginia is \$2.60 a ton, and I yet believe it is not more than 100 miles from here. So the freight rate is the large element in determining the sale point of the finished gypsum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I know nothing about those facts. I mean I knew nothing about them until the Senator informed me of them. I am very glad to hear them, and what the Senator has said reinforces the strength of my argument. If such a valuable product as rock gypsum, valuable for fertilizing purposes, valuable for cement, and valuable for plaster or for construction, is to be obtained in such a very cheap manner, is to be found right on the surface, so that all you have to do is to shovel it into a car and bring it to our people, it would be all the greater shame to put a heavy tax upon it and make it expensive to them. The blessings that God has given His children in this world, the valuable things that can be gotten cheaply, are not too great; and it would be folly, just in proportion as a thing is cheap and valuable, to make it cost more to your own people. It would be still more foolish to do that merely because somebody else wanted to make it cost more for their people to get some valuable thing cheaply from you. It is the old phrase of "cutting off your nose to spite your face." It is equivalent to saying: "Here, Canada, stop it. If you do not quit refusing to let your people have at a cheap rate our things that are worth a great deal to them, we will refuse to let the people of the Republic have at a cheap rate the things you have that are worth a great deal to them"—cutting off your nose to spite your face.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, this amendment is properly divisible; but inasmuch as apparently I have made no impression upon the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and believing as I did when I began that if I could not make an impression on him I had no hope of any recruits from the other side, I do not intend to ask for a roll call, and therefore I shall not ask for a division of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I now ask to have the Senate pass on the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 10, before the word "cements" it is proposed to strike out the word "building," so as to read:

76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, ground or calcined, pearl hardening for paper makers' use, Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, and all other cements not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of paragraph 77, page 19, as follows:

77. Pumice stone, unmanufactured, 5 per cent ad valorem; wholly or partially manufactured, $\frac{3}{4}$ cent per pound; manufactures of pumice stone, or of which pumice stone is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of this part of the bill why he deems it necessary to maintain a duty of 50 per cent on pumice stone wholly or partially manufactured, while he reduces the duty on the unmanufactured stone from 21 per cent to 5 per cent?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if we are going to have discussion of this paragraph, I think we had better proceed now to the consideration of executive business, and take up this paragraph to-morrow morning. I am told that it is desired to have an executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. The question will be pending.

Mr. BRISTOW. Pending; yes.

Mr. STONE. I move, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

BANKING AND CURRENCY (S. DOC. NO. 144).

Mr. OWEN. Just a moment, before the motion is acted upon. I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed a little four-page pamphlet which I have here upon the banking question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a public document?

Mr. OWEN. As a public document.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator who is the author of the document?

Mr. OWEN. The author is the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no doubt it is of great value.

Mr. OWEN. It is of great value.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply wish to ask the Senator whether it is a statement made by him in the Senate?

Mr. OWEN. It is not.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the request of the Senator from Oklahoma will be complied with.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, July 29, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28, 1913.

AMBASSADORS.

James W. Gerard to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Germany.

Frederic Courtland Penfield to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Austria-Hungary.

MINISTERS.

Charles S. Hartman to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Ecuador.

Joseph E. Willard to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Spain.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Charles S. Hamlin to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

James H. Barry to be naval officer of customs, district of San Francisco, Cal.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Justus S. Wardell to be surveyor of customs in the district of San Francisco, Cal.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Joseph J. Scott to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John O. Davis to be collector of customs for the district of San Francisco.

SOLICITOR GENERAL.

John William Davis to be Solicitor General.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Maurice T. Dooling to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Albert Schoonover to be United States attorney for the southern district of California.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

J. F. Goos, Sabula.

KANSAS.

Hugh O'Hara, Frontenac.

L. A. Walker, Parsons.

NEW YORK.

Frank C. Lent, Atlanta.

Frederick H. Payne, Berkshire.

Barton L. Piper, Watkins.

OKLAHOMA.

L. B. Avant, Avant.

J. H. Cunningham, Carnegie.

Lee Roy Daniels, Hydro.

J. C. Groves, Porum.

W. E. Hunt, Thomas.

J. E. McCutchan, Pawnee.

L. M. Nichols, Bristow.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *July 28, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our heavenly Father, we wait upon Thee for that light which never shone on sea or shore, but which illumines the soul and brings it in rapport with Thee; which is altogether reassuring, uplifting, ennobling, fitting it for whatever comes of joy or sorrow, hope or disappointment, victory or defeat. Give us of that light that we may go on our way with faith, hope, and confidence doing whatsoever our hands findeth to do with might, leaving the results to Thee, who doeth all things well, ruling and overruling by Thy providence for the good of Thy children. And we will praise Thy holy name forever. Amen.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] raises the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-one gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we will have a quorum present to-morrow. I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 29, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Leipsic River, Del. (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Public Printer submitting an estimate of appropriation for deficiency in the appropriation for leaves of absence for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 166); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce submitting an estimate of appropriation for subsistence, travel, and other expenses of detailed employees in the Bureau of the Census (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 7137) to provide for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at Mount Vernon, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 7139) to provide for the use of water power at Dam No. 41 in the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Resolution (H. Res. 213) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 214) directing the Civil Service Commission to transmit to the House all papers and documentary evidence in its possession relating to the solicitation of campaign funds in the Government building in the city of Atlanta in the year 1912, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7140) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Nicholls; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 7141) granting a pension to George W. Nave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 7142) granting an increase of pension to John Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7143) granting an increase of pension to David S. Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7144) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant F. Clutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7145) granting an increase of pension to Frank Unnerstall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7146) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sikeston, Mo., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Public Ownership Association of San Francisco, Cal., demanding that the United States Government take over the Central Pacific Railroad under Government ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against action of Austria in Balkan territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Public Ownership Association of San Francisco, Cal., asking that the Government take over the Central Pacific Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the overseers and voting operatives of the Appleton Mills, of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the wool and cotton schedules in the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Girard Life Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, protesting against a resolution for a Federal constitutional amendment granting suffrage to women of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Civil Service Reform League of New York, protesting against the clause in the tariff bill pro-